

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	15:00	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Living in what feels like 'ground zero' for the rapid increase in density through the Broadway Plan, I am disheartened to see the ODP promises to bring the same disruption to every neighbourhood of our city.</p> <p>I support the many points laid out in the recent letter produced by 30 experienced urbanists requesting city council to take a breath and rethink some of these plans, which will negatively impact our community for generations.</p> <p>I urge Councilors to give themselves more time to review thoroughly the concerns voiced by the seasoned professionals who penned the above mentioned document. Thank you.</p>	Eric Derbez	Fairview	
2026-03-09	15:06	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Eastside Chapter of the Vancouver Tenants’ Union. Can you please record our opposition to the Official Development Plan in its current form?</p> <p>Renters will be adversely impacted by the ODP. Not only does the ODP represent, in practice, a massive upzoning of all of Vancouver, including the Eastside, it would be devastating to any form of participatory democracy. Many checks and balances would be removed by prohibiting most public hearings, limiting transparency and people’s ability to have a say in their own neighbourhoods and homes. Many voices won’t be heard at all.</p> <p>By increasing height and density over large parts of the City, the ODP will cause renters to bear the brunt of redevelopment in the form of displacement and demoviction. This form of “development” has not been shown to have the support of the people of this city; the “Vancouver Plan” on which it is based completely lacked meaningful public participation. By contrast, the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan has a Citizens’ Assembly and this was the case in some of the other community plans (which would be overridden by the ODP). Vancouver tenants call on City Council to halt the passage of the ODP until there is meaningful participation from all parties, including renters, in its formulation.</p> <p>As it stands, the protections for renters are inadequate. Please reject the passage of the ODP.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Vancouver Tenants Union, Eastside Chapter</p>	Julia DaSilva	Grandview-Woodland	

2026-03-09	15:06	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Hello Mayor and Council;</p> <p>I oppose the 30-year official development plan.</p> <p>It is undemocratic to prohibit public input after the decision; that is, no longer is there the fundamental right of the citizens of Vancouver to give input at public hearings.</p> <p>The plan lacks crucial elements for a liveable city, such as parks, infrastructure, community centres, and schools. Our schools and community centres are already over capacity.</p> <p>The plan advances small but expensive units in the towers, which few people in Vancouver can truly afford. The quality of life in Vancouver is already diminishing due to a lack of affordability, and this plan only increases people's quality of life. It also changes and ruins the fabric of neighbourhoods by turning them into a city that is not in line with Canadian values, but more like those in far more crowded cities such as Hong Kong or Shanghai. As elected members of the city of Vancouver, you are charged to act in the best interest of the citizenry, not in the interest of contractors and developers.</p> <p>Thoughtful ideas and methodology was presented in community building plans, as well as presentations by those who understand urban planning and architecture, yet those have been ignored to the detriment of the city and its citizens.</p> <p>The mantra to build affordable housing is a farce, and is even more apparent as yellow memos are filed to exempt builders from the 20% below market value suites promised as a way to obtain approval.</p> <p>There is a mad rush to reconfigure our city into something unlivable. Please stop, now.</p>	Ruth Cherry	Mount Pleasant	
2026-03-09	15:39	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose the ODP for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) Lack of notification to the public - The ODP affects roughly 100,000 properties across Vancouver, yet the City has not directly notified the owners of those properties. It is likely that most residents have no idea this plan exists. A policy that will reshape Vancouver for the next three decades demands broad and transparent public notification.</p> <p>(2) Outcome does not benefit residents - The ODP would lock Vancouver into 30 years of intensified land inflation, speculation, and the demolition of more existing affordable housing than it would replace. Residents need housing that is truly affordable for workers earning average and lower wages, as well as larger units for families. Instead, the plan prioritizes towers containing small, expensive units that are out of reach for many middle-income households. When the City waives the requirement for 20% below-market rental units, it benefits developers but reduces the affordable housing that residents were promised. Also concerning is the loss of neighbourhood planning. A strong sense of community is fundamental to a liveable city but the ODP eliminates community plans in favour of a generic citywide framework aimed to reshape Vancouver into a city of sterile block-like towers rather than distinct neighbourhoods that residents value and identify with.</p> <p>(3) Lack of funding - Page 19 of the Referral Report states: "The City has identified a significant and growing infrastructure renewal funding deficit and funding challenges associated with expanding infrastructure and amenities to support growth. Given its limited financial capacity, the City will need to rationalize service levels and formulate strategic infrastructure and amenity plans that are financially viable and sustainable over the long term." Does this mean that due to the current lack of funding, infrastructure and amenity plans are unattainable and are to be reduced? Wouldn't a more sensible and responsible approach be to shelve further development plans until funding is arranged?</p> <p>(4) Crucial planning deficiencies - Although the ODP claims that more parks will be added, the sparse dots on the diagram on p.103, if you can find them, are miniscule and entirely inadequate or even non-existent in areas of massive densification. The City needs to increase infrastructure, parks, recreation, schools, community centres, and other amenities to support the massive increase in projected population growth but it acknowledges a lack of</p>	Valerie Porter	Kitsilano	

				<p>funding may require cutbacks to what is proposed in the ODP. Given the renderings of the \$54 million Granville Bridge upgrade compared to the sad and wasteful end result, I do not trust that the promotional images at the beginning of the ODP or the unfunded infrastructure and amenities in the Plan will become reality.</p> <p>(5) Elimination of democratic process - It is alarming that the ODP seeks to silence citizens by banning public hearings for any rezonings that comply with it, whether for a single lot or an entire neighbourhood-wide area, for the next 30 years.</p> <p>(6) Unnecessary and excessive - Why rush to remake our entire city, putting seniors and families at risk of displacement, when thousands of units are currently sitting empty and all of the projected growth to 2050 could be provided as soon as 2034 under zoning that has already been approved?</p> <p>30 prominent urban planners, architects, and academics have written to Council urging you to withdraw the plan. Please consider their concerns.</p> <p>I support additional density when it is implemented thoughtfully—by protecting existing affordability and directing growth to locations where it will not overburden neighbourhoods and where new development fits harmoniously within its surroundings. It should protect local businesses and unique storefronts, identify and preserve streetscapes and areas of special value (such as heritage homes, heritage storefronts, tree canopy, neighbourhood character, and key public views), retain heritage and character retention zones that incentivized multifamily conversions and infill, and ensure that infrastructure, parks, schools, amenities, and community services are adequately planned and funded to accommodate and keep pace with population growth.</p> <p>I do not support a plan that would fundamentally transform the city and the neighbourhoods residents love into something unrecognizable by producing more housing supply than is needed—primarily in the form of small expensive boxes—while largely benefiting the real estate industry groups driving this proposal as a profit-making opportunity.</p> <p>I urge Council members who are committed to representing their constituents and building a better future for the citizens of Vancouver to set aside the ODP.</p>			
2026-03-09	15:39	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am a property owner in the East Villages area and was never notified of the ODP proposal. I vehemently oppose its passing. I never received any notice of such a substantial change and protest the multiple infractions of the Vancouver Charter perpetrated by City staff and Council to force the ODP into existence.</p> <p>Our community is already subject to the imposition of a number of 6 storey buildings along the Broadway corridor and the surrounding residential streets. The public services that should have been part of the planning process all along is definitely "missing in action". For example, Trout Lake Community Centre has been at capacity since it was rebuilt, let alone what the expected population growth will require. This is a definite dereliction of duty to plan appropriately for anything other than more buildings and more development revenue, and nothing for the present or eventual residents of the area.</p>	Franco Ferrari	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	16:13	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I live in The neighbourhood closest to Trout Lake Nanaimo and Broadway and I completely oppose this plan. Firstly there's already too many six story buildings going into this neighbourhood. I believe in mixed use living yet this is starting to be takeover by six storey buildings, dominating the Neighbourhood. Plus all the public services that have been put in are already past their peak use so we need more services. It'll be even more population here that will overwhelm our community's public services. No plan I'm aware of to provide more services in anticipation. Secondly, there's too much construction going on at one time. We can't move our vehicle around because of the shortage of parking and blocked off areas. I'm handicap and I can't get around the neighbourhood because of all the blocked sidewalks and construction vehicles here. They even park in my handicap spot. Thirdly, we received no notice of the ODP and such a significant change to zoning and public notice.	Devorah Kahn	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	16:23	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>To Vancouver City Council: I oppose approval of the ODP and urge council to reject it for many reasons, including the following:</p> <p>Development of the ODP is problematic:</p> <p>The rationale that increasing supply will automatically increase affordability is flawed, as demonstrated by the last 10-15 years in Vancouver.</p> <p>Population projections were not provided by official government sources. Nonetheless, currently approved developments will accommodate expected population growth, raising the question of why additional development is needed.</p> <p>Inadequate public engagement. The ODP is markedly different from the Vancouver Plan. A limited number of outreach methods were confined to a one-month period in the fall of 2025. There has been no notification of the March 10 public hearing for the ODP to the thousands of residents who will be affected if the ODP is adopted.</p> <p>Content of the ODP is problematic:</p> <p>Public feedback during development indicated that the ODP content is complex, lacks clarity, and does not explain the relationship to other land use policies. Additional concerns include housing affordability, infrastructure lagging behind growth, loss of neighbourhood character, and limited public input processes if the ODP is adopted.</p> <p>Implementation of the ODP will problematic:</p> <p>The ODP will supercede previously approved community plans. By offering the same housing options across all areas, the OPD will impose a one-size-fits-all solution across Vancouver’s neighbourhoods, with an increased likelihood of tower construction.</p> <p>Most public hearings for proposed developments will be prohibited, limiting input and feedback from members of the public concerning changes in their own neighbourhood.</p> <p>The ODP contains no clear plans or funding for added infrastructure and community amenities such as parks, community centres or pools.</p> <p>Reduced oversight by the public and City Council will increase the likelihood of speculation by those who want to position themselves to take advantage of the ODP.</p> <p>Please reject the ODP.</p>	Ann Robson	West End	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	16:24	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am an original Vancouverite. I vehemently oppose the ODP. I live in Mount Pleasant and I have watched the choices made by the current City Counsellors and Major radically transform this city into a city of high rises. This affects the community, displaces many people in affordable rental suites and these decisions have no coordinated efforts to consider infrastructure of schools, roads, recreation facilities or green space. All of the safe guards that were in place for decades have been removed in haste without proper regard for the long term effects of these choices. I am also dismayed by the apparent disregard for the opinions of the residents who are currently living here. We are opposed to this in large numbers but no one seems to care or to listen. I say this because months ago I asked to speak at the meeting to decide about a high rise on the corner of Yukon and West 14th Ave. The meeting was slated for 9am and then on the day, it was moved to 5pm. At 10:28pm I was asked to get in line to speak. And then despite many objections, this high rise was agreed to by the council.</p> <p>I draw your attention the letter dated February 25th called: "A historic "Red Alert" from the professionals of Vancouver planning". Don't you think it would be worth considering that these people know what they are talking about? I certainly hope so.</p> <p>In any case, I totally oppose this plan and I hope that you reconsider what is happening to this city. There are many ways to increase density without building high rises. Let's consider some other low rise options.</p> <p>Your sincerely, Christie Dakin</p>	Christie Dakin	Mount Pleasant	
2026-03-09	16:24	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I do not support the current Vancouver Development Plan. The plan expects citizens to trust government decision-making regarding land use with no input from the community. There is no oversight. A community based affordable housing fund supported by government would be more effective. Instead, we are seeing the destruction of affordable housing units to make way for high-density, luxury-oriented, developer-driven growth at the expense of existing neighborhoods and long-term livability. There is no transparency on infrastructure capacity costs nor how communities are expected to manage already over-burdened schools, roads, parking, etcetera. This plan is being forced on citizens who will no doubt remember come election time.</p>	Barb Boychuk	Mount Pleasant	

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	16:29	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I OPPOSE the ODP for many reasons, those outlined here and those listed in my comments sent to Mayor and Councillors on 3 Nov 2025 (please see attachment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionable basis for purported number of future residents                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Apparently, projections for future population growth were carried out by a real-estate firm. These estimates were most probably based on “blue-sky” assumptions by an entity that may have “skin in the game”, i.e., a conflict of interest.</li> <li>2) In light of recent changes in regulations concerning immigration and foreign students, any such estimates of population growth should be recalculated—by an arms-length entity.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Affordability is NOT being addressed                             <p>For over 15 years, Vancouver has been undergoing massive construction of new housing units, but an affordability crisis STILL exists. This is indicative of an underlying problem: the housing being built is NOT the housing that is needed. Most units are beyond the financial reach of those whose incomes are in the middle-to-low ranges: only 20% of new units are to be “below-market”. But even this policy is undermined. In some instances, in the so-called Transit-oriented areas (TOA), developers have asked for changes to greater height AND for the removal of the requirement for 20% below-market units. [Note that the idea of a TOA was to have below-market units near to transit.] Three such instances are located in the TOA around the King Edward station of the Canada Line. If such changes are granted, it sets a dangerous precedent. Developers win, while the public is cheated.</p> <p>The public should be made aware of the small size of many newly constructed units. Only by carefully inspecting the tables and drawings in applications posted on Shape Your City can unit sizes be discovered.</p> </li> <li>• Housing construction as a “silo”                             <p>Planning for the construction of housing continues unabated, with no concomitant plans for the infrastructure needed to support a growing population: schools, amenities (community centres, playgrounds, etc.), green spaces, fire halls, police, traffic issues, healthcare, and ambulances. Indeed, the last-minute removal of wording in the ODP which protected school grounds from residential use is troubling, as is the unclear fate of those areas not officially designed as parks.</p> </li> <li>• Public consultation                             <p>Public input, especially through public hearings, are vital to a democracy. That the ODP could steam ahead without the public having a say is unacceptable.</p> </li> </ul> <p>Sincerely,                              Veronica Yakoleff                              Vancouver resident</p>	Veronica Yakoleff	South Cambie	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>

<p>2026-03-09</p>	<p>16:50</p>	<p>City of Vancouver Official Development Plan</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>There is a reason this Vancouver Plan is now called the Official Development Plan - it is a plan for indiscriminate development designed for developers and speculators rather than for the residents of Vancouver. There was no consultation with Vancouver's traditional Neighbourhoods. The only groups that seem to have been consulted were the developers. There has been no notification of the ramifications of this plan on individual homeowners and residents, who are the electorate and tax payers.</p> <p>Vancouver residents have always seen themselves as residents of a particular neighbourhood, identifying themselves as a resident of Kitsilano, Mount Pleasant, Dunbar, Killarney, etc. The Neighbourhood Community Visions of the 1990s, in which thousands of citizens were actually encouraged to take part, have all been abandoned. In this new ODP there is not one mention of either Dunbar or West Point Grey, and only 2 mentions of Kitsilano, etc.</p> <p>With massive indiscriminate densification everywhere, this ODP completely erases Vancouver's traditional neighbourhoods.</p> <p>There is no need to up-zone every area in the city because for many of the 22 neighbourhoods for which there were Community Visions, the allowable density in those plans has not been achieved. In many neighbourhood, there are empty and abandoned properties, leaving neighbourhood like West Point Grey and Dunbar with a great deal of currently allowable densification potential.</p> <p>In fact, it is Broadway that has been most affected by this indiscriminate increase in density, leaving the whole stretch of Broadway from east to west full of empty or underused properties, all derelict and sad, with nary a sign of life.</p> <p>Are the owners and speculators of these underused properties waiting for a potential windfall profit from the construction of a future tower?</p> <p>To make matters worse, the ODP has added a series of small "Neighbourhood Centres" often just intersections with just a couple of existing stores where further densification up to 12 storeys is allowed. This is madness, considering that there is not enough development in the existing neighbourhood commercial centres to create lively thriving streets.</p> <p>This ODP provides only towers and multiplexes, without any concern for the desires and need of citizens, and with no concern for providing the necessary parks, schools and community facilities.</p> <p>Why does the current Vancouver Planning Department seem to hire only people from other places, who come in and propose and enact changes to a community they do not even yet understand? In this ODP there seems to be no knowledge of Vancouver's architectural and building history, nor even any institutional memory of how the planning department in the past worked with the existing communities.</p> <p>By silencing citizens and banning any public consultation, this Vancouver City Council is giving up the city to speculators and developers, often foreign, who are looking for the highest possible development density to make the highest possible profit for themselves.</p> <p>It is time for the Vancouver City Council and the Planning Department to return to consultations with residents and neighbourhoods, and to provide the appropriate commercial areas and housing, together with the schools, community centres and parks, that the residents of Vancouver desire and deserve.</p>	<p>Imbi Harding</p>	<p>Dunbar-Southlands</p>
-------------------	--------------	--	---------------	--	---------------------	--------------------------

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	17:14	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Even with the inflated population projections up to 2050, the amount of development already approved in Vancouver or in the pipeline could be built out by 2034. This would suggest that no additional development actually needs to be approved beyond what is already in the pipeline, making the further development in the ODP a rash move, excessive, undemocratic, and unnecessary.	Beth Carroll		
2026-03-09	17:18	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>My concern for the Vancouver ODP is that its vast scope and stifling of public input comes on the cusp of what will hopefully be a new era that sees a more engaged citizenry vis-a-vis matters of our built environment. But presently we are still in a place of disengagement, voter apathy and passive acceptance of largely developer and power broker-driven "solutions" to our housing problems. Locking us in with this approach will be a tragic mistake. A fresh rethink on several fronts is required.</p> <p>There will be several detailed, better and research-supported presentations (compared to my brief comments here) and I look forward to those. I don't think we're at a place where this will end well. There is still too much reliance on real estate industry "expertise" and input and we are not clear of a general over reliance on real estate as an economic driver. This kind of wholesale planning only works when we're collectively and massively better informed and understand the ramifications of a huge building spree that will reflect a rather desperate and fractious period.</p> <p>PS I live in a 50 unit, four storey, high density building on Broadway. It's great. I'd like to see more. But I doubt we'll end up with the variety of ownership/rental types required. There need to be mandates for affordability mixes that are meaningful and go much farther than what we've seen thus far. Natural market churn does not work here when it comes to upscaling for density. Good, affordable buildings will still go down because someone can make more money.</p>	Mark Mushet	Kitsilano	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	17:22	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>I am opposed to the ODP, city of Vancouver Official Development Plan as it currently stands.</p> <p>My concerns echo the concerns of the citizens of Vancouver who have already asked to be heard and respected. I repeat them here.</p> <p>The Vancouver ODP must be paused and carefully re-evaluated to address numerous concerns. Increased clarity, details, transparency and consultation are needed before the ODP is adopted.</p> <p>COV must continue to protect the rights of Vancouver constituents to engage in public consultation and have a say on city development.</p> <p>I ask and encourage you to refer to "organization Housing Reset" - Withdraw the ODP: open letter from HousingReset.ca.</p> <p>Some of their concerns that are mine as well:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Questionable Population and Unit Projection Methodology.</li> <li>2. Excessive Development without Affordability.</li> <li>3. Inadequate Infrastructure, Parks, Recreation, Schools and Amenities.</li> <li>4. Loss of Participatory Planning, Neighbourhood Context and Transparent Approvals.</li> <li>5. Excessive Literal Implementation of Provincial Mandates.</li> </ol> <p>In conclusion I add my name to the many Vancouver Residents who :</p> <p>" urge the City to withdraw the ( ODP) Official Development Plan and refer back to staff for reconsideration through a democratic participatory planning process that prioritizes planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods with a truly sustainable future. The Vancouver Official Development Plan should have pervasive public participation that is reflected in this plan's final development, before adoption.</p> <p>sincerely, Carol Van Camp</p>	Carol VanCamp	Mount Pleasant	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	17:45	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I live in a proposed Villages area and strongly oppose adding 6 story condo buildings in any of the proposed Villages area. These buildings are far too large in scale and dwarf houses/duplexes/multiplexes beside them.</p> <p>We were never consulted about this. Last fall we received a postcard in the mail that said 'Villages Plan Implementation 2050'. 2050! Implementation is actually 2026 as you know. These postcards did not state - "do you agree with 6 story buildings constructed next to 3 story residences?" The card simply directed you to additional information. That additional information also said the Villages Plan would go forward to Council in the Spring 2026. Well it's not Spring is it. There is no additional information on the Villages website as to when it will be considered or that it will be considered along with the ODP. I even signed up for email updates and have not received any.</p> <p>I asked 20 of our closest neighbours about this proposal. A scant few had even heard of a Villages plan and a couple thought that additional service at busy intersections could be a good idea. NOT A SINGLE PERSON KNEW OF THE PROPOSAL TO ADD 6 STORY BUILDINGS ANYWHERE IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD. That's 0 of 20. Does this shock you? Because it should. We have not been sufficiently consulted. Nobody knows about it.</p> <p>100% of our neighbours vehemently OPPOSED 6 story buildings off arterials.</p> <p>Do you not believe that as existing residents we should be sufficiently notified about the proposal to rezone our properties to allow for adjacent 6 story buildings? I hope you do because that is how Municipalities and democracies work. I trust that you now know (and should have previously) that we have not been notified or consulted.</p> <p>If you approve this plan, existing residents will have no light and be dwarfed by out of scale monstrosities. Have you walked these beautiful neighbourhoods? Have you stood next to a 6 story building that has recently been constructed beside an existing residence? Vancouver neighbourhoods will be ruined and you will have allowed that.</p> <p>I believe in adding density. My wife and I built 4 registered address in a duplex on a 33' lot. We live in one of those addresses. This proposal to add 6 story buildings however is too aggressive, too excessive. You have already increased density by 100s of thousands of residents with the Broadway Plan/Province TOA's/Renfrew/multiplexes, etc. Enough is enough. This is not needed at this time. No building should be allowed that exceeds the current zoning of 3 storeys!</p> <p>I'm incensed that this is even being considered, let alone without consultation. I can't believe that I have to be writing this opposition. This proposal has wasted staff time and our tax dollars and should never have gotten to this stage. Please do the right thing and send this back to staff for proper consultation.</p>	Kevin Sharp	Grandview-Woodland	

2026-03-09	18:37	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am hoping the city reads these comments, the last time I was in opposition for zoning that had to do with Nelson school. I was left on hold on the phone, and my views were not heard.</p> <p>I am writing to strongly oppose the City of Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) as proposed. I urge Council to refer this back to staff for reconsideration through a meaningful public participatory process, before adoption. The ODP continues to rely on flawed principles of primarily promoting more supply entitlements that inflate land values, and displace thousands of residents, without addressing the fundamental lack of affordable housing. This is doing more harm than good. This plan promotes excessive development without affordability, inadequate infrastructure, parks and schools and the loss of participatory planning, neighbourhood context and transparent approvals process. Please withdraw the plan and refer it back to staff for reconsideration through a democratic planning process that prioritizes planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods with a truly sustainable future.</p> <p>Thank you if you have read to the end.</p>	Susan Russell	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-03-09	18:41	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the City of Vancouver ODP and have already sent comments with my many concerns.</p> <p>I reiterate my request to City Council to withdraw the ODP, or at the very least postpone its adoption.</p> <p>I completely support and endorse the Open letter from HousingReset.ca to Vancouver on Official Development Plan (ODP) (Public Hearing March 10, 2026) posted on the city website on Feb. 25, 2026. (Full statement from HousingReset.ca at <a href="https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/">https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/</a>) File attached.</p> <p>The Open letter from HousingReset.ca should be given serious consideration, as its authors are Metro Vancouver region-based urbanists, urban planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics, most with decades of experience, some with a background in development, who have joined together to broaden the search for enduring housing solutions. Their previous letters can be found at <a href="https://housingreset.ca">HousingReset.ca</a>.</p> <p>These are highly competent professionals who recognize the importance of citywide and regional planning, and their voice should not be ignored. Their joint expertise and competence is very valuable, and should not be dismissed by a few individuals making decisions at City Hall. The Open letter from HousinReset.ca clearly express major concerns and strong opposition to the City of Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) as proposed.</p> <p>Those same concerns have been eloquently expressed over and over by many residents, but have been constantly ignored by City Council.</p> <p>Why does City Council listen to a few realtors and developers, instead of listening to the numerous urban experts, competent professionals and a majority of Vancouver residents who oppose the ODP ?</p> <p>The future living environment of residents and their quality of life of are being threatened by the ODP. Vancouver history, character, heritage architecture, existing neighborhoods, human scale housing units, small businesses, green canopy and public spaces are going to be erased forever by the proposed ODP.</p> <p>City Council seems intent on destroying our beautiful city and making it unlivable in the name of greed and profit. Building hundreds of huge, ugly towers with tiny units where nobody wants to live, does not provide affordable housing and does not create livable communities.</p>	Annie Cassells	Mount Pleasant	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>

While every major development application for huge towers which destroy neighbourhood, disrupt lives and displace tenants, has unanimously been approved by City Council, there hasn't been a single approved development application for new community centers, indoor/outdoor pools (including a full 50-meter indoor pool), schools, or real parks (not ridiculous little plazas taking away street space). The ODP doesn't provide any concrete funding and timely plan for much needed recreational and educational infrastructure needed to make communities complete and livable. Towers alone do not create quality of life or safe, pleasant, livable communities.

In contrast, Burnaby, with a much smaller population is spending over 900 millions to invest in several large community centers and pools, and half of those projects are nearing 50% completion. Burnaby is investing in the quality of life of its residents and providing the facilities needed to accommodate growth. Why can't the City of Vancouver follow suit ?

I urge you to listen to Vancouver residents: we are your constituents and we are directly affected by the poor decisions you make if you approve the ODP. The City of Vancouver needs to use general guidelines for long term urban planning, but must proceed by incremental 10-year phases to properly assess changing situations, demand, needs, costs, etc. and change course if needed. We don't want to end up with a glut of new, ugly, empty towers that will change our city forever.

Once again, I urge Council to refer the ODP back to staff for reconsideration through a meaningful public participatory process, before adoption.  
The ODP is based on the very flawed Vancouver Plan Urban Growth Strategy that was approved in 2022 by the previous council without meaningful public participation. It continues to rely on the same flawed principles of primarily promoting more supply entitlements that inflate land values, and displace thousands of residents, without addressing the fundamental lack of affordable housing. This is doing more harm than good for the public interest.  
Do the right thing and withdraw the ODP, or at the very least postpone its adoption.  
Thank You.

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	18:49	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Hi! Since 2004, I have been an owner of a condo property in Mt. Pleasant. I reside at Yukon Street and W.15th Ave. The heritage style residences & neighbourhood, plus the great community appealed. Pricey to purchase, we made and continue to make sacrifices to own here. During this time, I am now a senior with mobility issues and sensitivities to noise. I am close to VGH, my medical appointments, transit. Birds of prey nest in these tall trees every spring, Cooper Hawks, and Owls nest in the Monkey Pod trees across from the proposed development at Yukon and 14th Avenue. They keep the rodent population down. I will be having to sell my condo due to financial stress but wish to remain in the area. Will it be affordable to me? I'm afraid the new development rental building proposed may not accommodate an unemployed and injured lower income senior, nor perhaps even middle class individuals. I too am curious as to how inclusivity, equality and diversity will be a top priority for accessibility, and for potential renters in the new tower the city is proposing. Can you expand on this please, provide plans and solutions to address critical concerns? As well, home values have dropped due to this proposal according to recent assessment & Real Estate agents. Even with a recent renovation in my condo. This apartment building will impact our community negatively on multiple levels, including safety. As a volunteer with Vancouver Police Dept. in this neighbourhood for more than 13 years, I am aware of the crime and prevention in the area. Risks are high for increased criminal activity. Parking is at a premium now. When the construction begins, not unlike at present, our parking will be limited for months with crew workers and contractors. The noise from construction is excruciating for me. I feel and can hear the concrete banging and drilling, I live in a ground suite. I have no peace with constant development in the area. I wish my neighbourhood to remain safe, quiet and away from the Cambie street traffic and noise. Please re-consider your citizens needs and safety requirements, and that of the environment. Perhaps table this building until 2027 when more time can be provided to residents to be heard, listened to, and considered. Thank you for your time. Also, could you confirm the owls that nest in the Monkey Pod trees across the street from the proposed development are not an "at risk species" please. V. Lapinski	Violetta Lapinski	Mount Pleasant	
2026-03-09	19:03	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	As a student at UBC who has frequently moved into and out of the city of Vancouver there is nothing which was more frustrating than living in locations without stores in walking distance. This makes the lack of mixed use areas in this plane especially in southern and western Vancouver disappointing. Why can we not have neighborhoods with local stores, mon and pop shops and cafes?	Adam Schmitt	I do not live in Vancouver	
2026-03-09	19:45	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I oppose the ODP for reasons as per the attached letter.	Tony Kavelaars	West Point Grey	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-03-09	19:49	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I oppose the ODP as per letter attached below.	Mary Stanley	West Point Grey	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-03-09	19:53	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Strongly opposed	Liz Thomas	Kerrisdale	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	20:09	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am not feeling represented by this municipal council. The ODP is a transformational plan that needs to be redesigned to reflect the needs of neighbourhoods. I have received no response from elected officials or from staff to my numerous comments expressing concern about the destructive planning and blanket approval processes in this city that put developer interests ahead of residents, and advances inappropriate density in many of the wrong places.</p> <p>Residents need to continue to have the democratic right to have input into planning proposals that affect them. With many residents heavily invested in their homes, rampant and inappropriate densification removes enjoyment of the natural light, views and streetscapes that have long been a feature of our neighbourhoods.</p> <p>While the province of B.C. has asked municipalities to build homes, the intent was not to begin destroying the existing neighbourhood streets we live on, but to do smart planning and to densify where it makes the most sense and helps with affordability.</p> <p>Many of these infills make absolutely no sense and is an affront to maintaining streetscapes and enjoyment of private property. It's actually shameful that city permits were granted for the current monster 6-plexes being built in the wrong places where long standing setback rules and height restrictions have been abandoned, as well as the need for developers to contribute to neighbourhood amenities.</p> <p>Coun. Sarah Kirby-Yung is on record as comparing proposed high rise developments in quiet west side neighbourhoods to "boiling the ocean" to get 10 glasses of desalinated water.</p> <p>This comment could equally apply to the one-off approvals of 6 residences on interior residential lots, many of which tower over the neighbouring residences and block natural light.</p> <p>There is no need for these in-fills, apart from making developers and their non-resident real estate moguls richer.</p> <p>The Villages Plan is also completely flawed and unjustified as existing mixed commercial use areas such as the businesses along Dunbar Street are suffering and will only suffer more if the Villages Plan is allowed to proceed. Please listen to the comments from engaged voters on these issue as they will surely become a ballot box issue come October.</p>	Ross Neil	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-03-09	21:08	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am very much opposed to the present Official Development Plan. It needs to go back to the drawing board. We do not need any more unaffordable housing . We need nuanced and thoughtful housing which fits in to individual neighborhoods. We need many more recreational spaces suitable for all ages . We especially need more small community pools for swimming lessons and exercise for all ages.Thirty experts wrote to you regarding this plan . Take heed and vote against it.</p>	Pamela Lockhart	Arbutus Ridge	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-09	21:23	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I oppose the Official City Development Plan for many reasons, but especially I object to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the adoption of one plan for the entire city</li> <li>- the prohibition of public hearings for most new developments</li> <li>- the focus on high rise buildings</li> </ul>	Lynn Brockington	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-03-09	21:41	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The Dunbar Residents’ Association Board strongly opposes the Vancouver Official Development Plan as proposed. We urge Council to send it back to staff for revision after more public consultation and input.</p> <p>We have three main concerns:</p> <p>One is that members of our community have not been properly engaged, consulted or informed about the plan. The “extensive” consultation referred to in the referral report never happened in Dunbar. Most residents don’t know about the plan or even about the current public hearing.</p> <p>Our second concern is the plan’s elimination of public hearings for most rezonings. This means residents will no longer be able to go before council to explain the impacts of developments on their lives, or to propose ways of mitigating any problems.</p> <p>Our third concern is the densification this plan means for our neighbourhood, without our knowledge or collaboration. We know that Dunbar can accommodate more housing and more people, and we welcome the increased vitality that will bring to our streets and businesses. But most residents have no idea of the number, size and height of buildings the ODP allows, and that there are no concrete plans for new amenities for the bigger population.</p> <p>We think planning for new housing in our community should be done in collaboration with residents, instead of coming as a surprise.</p> <p>Please DO NOT approve this plan as proposed. Please send it back to staff for proper collaboration with residents so we can all contribute to making our neighbourhood better.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Board of Directors Dunbar Residents' Association</p>	Dunbar Residents' Association Board	Dunbar-Southlands	

2026-03-09	21:49	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I have attended several Council hearings over the last six months opposing rezoning applications for highrises of over16 stories, but in each instance the application was approved, despite well researched opposition by hundreds of Vancouver residents. The proposed square, concrete highrise buildings, built out to the property line, don't 'fit' in historical multiplex neighbourhoods. Also, the schools, libraries, and community centres are overflowing and parking will also be an issue. If the new housing was six story timber apartments that would lessen the significant loss of livability for current residents.</p> <p>It is the job of City Staff to ensure our city remains livable, and the job of City Council to listen to the residents who elected them. Based on my involvement thus far, I have no confidence in either City Council or Staff. regarding development in the City of Vancouver. I am vehemently opposed to the obvious lack of proper planning and to the City of Vancouver 'Official Development Plan'.</p>	Mary Irvine	Kitsilano	
2026-03-09	22:28	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Mount Pleasant – Concerns Regarding Proposed High-Rise Development As a 25 year resident of Mount Pleasant, I am essentially re-submitting the following concerns regarding the proposed hi-rise development at West 14th and Yukon, however the themes addressed pertain more broadly to Vancouver’s Official Development Plan. I appreciate the City’s ongoing efforts to address housing needs and support increased density where appropriate. I also recognize that responsible growth is essential to ensuring long-term affordability and livability. However, I have significant concerns regarding the introduction of high rise buildings within the interior residential streets of Mount Pleasant. While I support forms of “gentle density,” such as single family homes converted to multi unit dwellings and low rise apartment buildings that maintain neighbourhood character, high rise development in this specific context is incompatible with the existing built form and local infrastructure.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Character and Compatibility Mount Pleasant is defined by its heritage style homes, mature trees, and a residential fabric that has evolved thoughtfully over time. Many houses have already been converted into multi family dwellings with three or more units, demonstrating that density can be increased while preserving neighbourhood identity. The introduction of large high rise towers in the middle of these small residential streets would significantly alter the character that draws residents to this community. High rise forms are better suited to areas with established commercial activity, broader streets, and existing higher density patterns. In contrast, Mount Pleasant’s narrow streets and heritage focused residential blocks are not designed to absorb the visual, environmental, and traffic impacts associated with tower development.</p> <p>Infrastructure Capacity The neighbourhood’s aging infrastructure is already strained. Community amenities—including parks, recreation spaces, and local services—are experiencing high demand, and additional large scale development will further challenge their capacity. The existing water, sewage, and transportation networks were not designed to support the population increases associated with high rise development. Locating major density increases near commercial corridors or transit oriented hubs would align more effectively with infrastructure capacity and the City’s broader planning objectives.</p> <p>Traffic and Safety Impacts Traffic conditions in the area are already problematic. Residents regularly witness illegal and unsafe turns, speeding through laneways, and congestion caused by drivers attempting to bypass ongoing construction and blockages. These behaviours pose increasing risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and other motorists on streets designated as “Quiet” or as bike routes. Construction traffic associated with a high rise development—dump trucks, concrete trucks, and related heavy vehicles—would exacerbate these risks and disrupt daily life for extended periods.</p> <p>Parking and Access Constraints</p>	Sandra Muller	Mount Pleasant	

				<p>On street parking is already extremely limited, with many residents unable to park near their homes despite purchasing residential permits. Restrictions and signage are frequently ignored. Service vehicles often block lane access, preventing residents from reaching their garages or parking spaces and creating ongoing frustration. These challenges would only increase with a significant rise in population density on narrow residential streets.</p> <p>Community Investment and Livability Residents were not consulted nor community input sought in the development of this proposal. Many residents chose to live and invest in Mount Pleasant precisely because of its managed density, sense of community, and unique residential character. The proposed high rise development risks eroding these qualities over time. Preserving the neighbourhood's scale and form is essential to maintaining its livability and long term appeal.</p> <p>Conclusion and Recommendation I respectfully urge the City to reconsider the placement of high rise towers within the interior residential streets of Mount Pleasant. While increased density is both necessary and welcome in many parts of Vancouver, it must be implemented in a manner that respects established neighbourhood character, aligns with infrastructure capacity, and prioritizes safety and livability. More suitable locations for high density development include areas near commercial zones, major transit routes, and corridors designed to support large scale growth. Concentrating new high rise buildings in these areas will better achieve the City's housing objectives while preserving the valued qualities of Mount Pleasant.</p>			
2026-03-09	22:35	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the City of Vancouver ODP and have already sent comments with my many concerns.</p> <p>I reiterate my request to City Council to withdraw the ODP, or at the very least postpone its adoption.</p> <p>I completely support and endorse the Open letter from HousingReset.ca to Vancouver on Official Development Plan (ODP) (Public Hearing March 10, 2026) posted on the city website on Feb. 25, 2026. (Full statement from HousingReset.ca at <a href="https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/">https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/</a>)</p> <p>The Open letter from HousingReset.ca should be given serious consideration, as its authors are Metro Vancouver region-based urbanists, urban planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics, most with decades of experience, some with a background in development, who have joined together to broaden the search for enduring housing solutions. Their previous letters can be found at HousingReset.ca .</p> <p>These are highly competent professionals who recognize the importance of citywide and regional planning, and their voice should not be ignored. Their joint expertise and competence is very valuable, and should not be dismissed by a few individuals making decisions at City Hall. The Open letter from HousinReset.ca clearly express major concerns and strong opposition to the City of Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) as proposed.</p> <p>Those same concerns have been eloquently expressed over and over by many residents, but have been constantly ignored by City Council.</p> <p>Why does City Council listen to a few realtors and developers, instead of listening to the numerous urban experts, competent professionals and a majority of Vancouver residents who oppose the ODP ?</p> <p>The future living environment of residents and their quality of life of are being threatened by the ODP. Vancouver history, character, heritage architecture, existing neighborhoods,</p>	Stephen Cassells	Mount Pleasant	

				<p>human scale housing units, small businesses, green canopy and public spaces are going to be erased forever by the proposed ODP.</p> <p>City Council seems intent on destroying our beautiful city and making it unlivable in the name of greed and profit. Building hundreds of huge, ugly towers with tiny units where nobody wants to live, does not provide affordable housing and does not create livable communities.</p> <p>While every major development application for huge towers which destroy neighbourhood, disrupt lives and displace tenants, has unanimously been approved by City Council, there hasn't been a single approved development application for new community centers, indoor/outdoor pools (including a full 50-meter indoor pool), schools, or real parks (not ridiculous little plazas taking away street space). The ODP doesn't provide any concrete funding and timely plan for much needed recreational and educational infrastructure needed to make communities complete and livable. Towers alone do not create quality of life or safe, pleasant, livable communities.</p> <p>In contrast, Burnaby, with a much smaller population is spending over 900 millions to invest in several large community centers and pools, and half of those projects are nearing 50% completion. Burnaby is investing in the quality of life of its residents and providing the facilities needed to accommodate growth. Why can't the City of Vancouver follow suit ?</p> <p>I urge you to listen to Vancouver residents: we are your constituents and we are directly affected by the poor decisions you make if you approve the ODP. The City of Vancouver needs to use general guidelines for long term urban planning, but must proceed by incremental 10-year phases to properly assess changing situations, demand, needs, costs, etc. and change course if needed. We don't want to end up with a glut of new, ugly, empty towers that will change our city forever.</p> <p>Once again, I urge Council to refer the ODP back to staff for reconsideration through a meaningful public participatory process, before adoption. The ODP is based on the very flawed Vancouver Plan Urban Growth Strategy that was approved in 2022 by the previous council without meaningful public participation. It continues to rely on the same flawed principles of primarily promoting more supply entitlements that inflate land values, and displace thousands of residents, without addressing the fundamental lack of affordable housing. This is doing more harm than good for the public interest. Do the right thing and withdraw the ODP, or at the very least postpone its adoption. Thank You. Stephen</p>			
2026-03-09	22:57	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>You are ruining neighborhoods; kits and moit pleasant are mostly already multi residential properties already. They commonly are lower rents with some having 3 or 4 bedrooms what the city really needs. Replacing with high rises ruins the neighborhoods, does not lower property values but raises, increases rents (as-development cost are significant) and creates a shortage for larger units more suitable for families. We do nor have rental shortage given the shadow inventory and the rental unit construction fast tracked already. Slow down and take a pause.</p>	Michael Atkinson	Mount Pleasant	
2026-03-09	23:20	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Despite thoughtful, &amp; may I add hopeful, community comments &amp; suggestions, most rezoning applications &amp; all votes to restrict public input have been approved. This seems like another placating exercise but I do want to register strong opposition.</p>	Susan Mackey-Jamieson	Mount Pleasant	

2026-03-09	23:22	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	When taxpaying residents are not allowed a voice in their own community something is seriously wrong with our city and democracy.. Although this plan embraces increasing density there are no plans to increase parks, community centers, schools or anything else that an Urban population needs. Vancouver is the densest city in Canada and the fourth densest in North America and yet are rents continue to climb. The old caveat that density leads to affordability has been proven over and over again that it is wrong, but this is the mantra the development industry keeps pushing. This plan needs genuine input from the people who live here, not so called phony open houses where staff have no interest in input from citizens but just push the party line. We don't need a city with nothing but tall bulky towers that offer spaces that are not suitable for families, just investors which is what the development industry wants.	Barbara May	Renfrew-Collingwood	
2026-03-09	23:24	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>You are making these decisions in a vacuum without broad public knowledge or support. Perhaps you should send a survey (not just a postcard that says "Implementation 2050" !!! with no other substantive information) to all of the neighbourhoods affected by your Villages plan and ask if they support 6 story buildings adjacent to existing residences. I have never heard of a worse idea. The number of responses you received from your 'so called' Villages consultation is a tiny fraction of the populous or even the residents in these areas. This is what you are basing your decision on? That's deceitful.</p> <p>The vast majority of my social circle, good friends, family and acquaintances live in Vancouver. I keep asking and none of these people know about the Villages proposal nor of the ODP being rushed through to approval without sufficient consultation.</p> <p>Every single one of them is opposed to building any structure taller than 3 storeys in these established neighbourhoods. Allowing anything more is an abomination. To propose such, is a horrendous idea and will forever change what makes Vancouver such a liveable city.</p> <p>NO to an ODP that is ill thought out and doesn't consider any real consultation with affected landowners or the City in general. Your Villages open houses saw If you vote yes, I truly hope lawsuits will overturn this deceitful act by City Staff and Council. Nobody knows about this!</p>	Jennifer Sharp	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-03-09	23:43	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Although other cities in BC are pushing against the NDP provincial government's draconian legislation the COV not only embraces it but are approving much more density than the province even asked for. This one sized model fits all does not work in a city like Vancouver that is comprised of very unique neighbourhoods. This plan not only ignores neighbourhood plans that have been developed in conjunction with city staff over the years it does not provide for parks, community centers, swimming pools, and schools and other institutions that make a community. Single homes are to be replaced by blocky six storey apartments, older affordable rental buildings are being torn down to be replaced by towers that generally offer a very small living space for a very high rent. This plan is not what the majority of Vancouverites. Many homeowners and renters have not been advised by the city as to what is in store for them but I am sure they will remember in October how the current majority ABC municipal and the Green, One City and Cope councillors also consistently voted for density regardless of whether these projects were suitable or not. What the city needs is family oriented affordable housing and they have not come even close to achieving this.	Paolo Meret	Kitsilano	
2026-03-09	23:43	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	It is shocking that the province would stop Public Hearings for any reason, but especially on some building applications. As we have seen in Vancouver, there are far too many cases of buildings being approved even though major flaws in them are known even at the design phase (let alone whether they include residential spaces or not). Why stop citizens from voicing their opinions in public forums: you just don't want to hear from us?	Jane Murphy Thomas	West End	
2026-03-09	23:55	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I support the letter from my strata council demanding that the land use zoning for VR 452 be the same or more dense than the Arbutus Centre across the street as was considered in the original ARKS plan.</p> <p>To: City Council</p>	Megan Lewis	Arbutus Ridge	

Re: City of Vancouver Official Development Plan  
From: Strata Council of VR 452

I am writing on behalf of the strata council of VR 452. We are 40 townhouses located immediately south of Arbutus Centre on Arbutus Street at Nanton Street. We have concerns about the fairness in how our parcel is being considered for potential land use and zoning under the ODP and think that it should be zoned similarly to Arbutus Centre. We also have concerns that City Staff did not follow the ARKS Community Vision that mandated considering the zoning of VR 452 when the City was considering the upzoning and planning of Arbutus Centre and in considering this new land use ODP.

BACKGROUND

The Policy Report: Development and Building dated October 4, 2005 on Adoption of the Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaugnessy and Riley Park / South Cambie Community Visions ("ARKS") expressly contemplated the development of the former Arbutus Village, now Arbutus Centre.

It also considered the parcels immediately south, including VR 452 and 4505 Valley. In particular, it considered whether to "extend the Shopping Areas South of Arbutus Shopping Centre" and whether, should development of Arbutus shopping centre take place, that the west side of Arbutus as far as the strip mall at Arbutus and Nanton should be rezoned as residential/commercial "mixed use" developments. This concept was classified as "Uncertain" at the time but ARKS clearly stated that rezoning of VR 452 was to "remain[s] on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional planning occurs at the shopping centre site [Arbutus Centre]".

Under the Arbutus Centre Policy Statement of June 2008, a new planning document for Arbutus Centre established a mixed-use residential concept of 6-8 storeys with retail at grade and housing above. Major upzoning occurred in 2011 with a new CD-1 zoning and significantly higher density consistent with the Policy Statement. In 2018, the proponents received another CD-1 text amendment to increase the density and height of the towers. The 2024 amended Policy Statement contemplates further density.

To our knowledge, the City did not engage in public discussion of extending the zoning to the VR-452 parcel when any of the planning phases occurred on the shopping centre site. This should have happened when each of the amendments to Arbutus Centre zoning and planning were made and increased density for VR 452 should be part of this ODP.

The ODP  
Generalized Land Use  
According to the ODP:

The Generalized Land Use (GLU) designations provide a high-level overview of development potential under current land use policies and regulations across the city. Each designation outlines the intended land uses, development intensities and building heights (where applicable) and generalizes them into broad categories to quickly convey the high-level land use intent for a parcel. These designations are mapped at the parcel level and can be visualized in the GLU Map (See Figure 4). The GLU and associated policy directions will be used to inform development and specifically to help determine whether an application to develop a site is consistent with the ODP. [...] The GLU summarizes the highest possible development potential for a site based on these underlying regulations or policies, and maps these designations across the city on the GLU map.

At page 10 of the ODP, is the GLU map. Going north to south on Arbutus:

- the Arbutus Centre is located in red (High Rise 1 Mixed Use)
- parcel VR 452 and the adjoining Arbutus Care Centre seniors home (4505 Valley) between Nanton and Valley in plain yellow (Multiplex Residential)
- the former strip mall and former gas station (4615 Arbutus) and the townhomes recently acquired by Cressey (4683 Arbutus) (to be developed into 69 homes) between Valley and 32nd are in pink (Low Rise Mixed Use)
- the parcel with the church between 32nd and 33rd is in orange (Low Rise Residential)

This creates a non-sensical, unreasonable, and arbitrary zoning pattern along Arbutus. The density should be highest next to the Arbutus Centre. Instead, VR 452 is considered to be the lowest density of land use despite being immediately next to the highest level density. This is inconsistent with the discussion in the ARKS document which acknowledges that the parcels to the south of Arbutus Centre should be considered for zoning that is comparable to Arbutus Centre.

The Urban Structure Strategy at page 9 similarly has this inconsistency. The Arbutus Centre and the strip mall are in medium purple ("High Street") and the remainder, including VR 452, are in lighter purple ("Neighbourhood Centre"). Again, parcel VR 452 should have the same land or higher use characteristic as the Arbutus Centre across the street.

In short, similar parcels should have similar land use planning and VR 452 should have the same (or higher to reflect new densification goals) land use as Arbutus Centre.

SIDE EFFECTS OF DENSIFICATION OF PROPERTY NEAR VR 452

General Effects Interfering with Use and Enjoyment

Residents of VR 452 have suffered from a densification around them.

- On-street parking has been essentially eliminated without consultation, impacting residents who want to have guests or move furniture and impacting the maintenance of the property by maintenance people who cannot park.
- Traffic patterns including usage of and parking on Nanton Avenue has been eliminated without consultation.
- Ongoing construction including Arbutus Centre (for several years), the retirement home on Nanton and Arbutus (SE corner)(Arbutus 4330-4408), the development of the strip mall, and the anticipated development of the townhome apartments between Valley and 32nd means there is constant noise, construction workers are parking in what limited parking there is on Arbutus Street, and there is construction debris left that causes flat tires.
- There is occasional trespass of VR 452 common property and increased refuse and animal waste around the property from pet owners in the new developments

Specific Issue: Water Main Flood of February 7, 2026

Recently, flooding from a City water main affected VR 452. We expect that it will be proven that this was due to lack of maintenance and upgrade of very old neighbourhood infrastructure (over 50 years old) and increased load from development at the Arbutus Centre site.

Several residents lost their cars and experienced basement flooding, causing significant personal and financial hardship. This situation underscores the urgent need for modernization and new construction better suited to current challenges."

City sewer and runoff drains are also no longer fit for purpose.

Summary of issues

VR 452 is surrounded by densification and development that is putting strain on both quiet enjoyment and City infrastructure.

The parcel should be upzoned to reflect that the neighbourhood has changed and that the parcel should begin a move toward redevelopment. As the ARKS document recognizes, it is clear that it should be considered for similar zoning as Arbutus Centre.

SUMMARY

The VR 452 parcel represents a unique site within the neighborhood for high-density expansion of Arbutus Centre with its flat rectangular lot and proximity to key infrastructure. It was contemplated under ARKS that the land use planning and zoning of VR 452 would be revisited to be consistent with Arbutus Centre. Instead, under the ODP, VR 452 would have the lowest density between Arbutus Centre and 33rd, despite being immediately across Nanton Street from the high density Arbutus Centre and on a similar flat rectangular lot. This is an arbitrary and inconsistent outcome.

				<p>Accordingly, parcel VR 452 should be considered for the same or higher high-rise land use / zoning as the Arbutus Centre under the ODP.</p> <p>We would be please to initiate a dialogue with City Council and Staff to discuss this matter further.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>VR 452 Strata Council</p>			
2026-03-10	00:10	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose the Official Development Plan because it is - too much density without neighbourhood consultation. There is too much density because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. where does the City intend to get drinking water for all these people in all this increased density.</li> <li>2. where is all the sewage going to go. Is Metro Vancouver going to build a HUGE sewer cleaning plant for all this increased density. This needs to be in place before any consideration of policies for more density in Vancouver. Or are you just going wait and see and end up with a wastewater treatment plant like the over budget, unfinished plant in North Vancouver.</li> </ol> <p>You are putting the cart before the horse yet again.</p>	Grace Mackenzie	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2026-03-10	00:41	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I support the opinions expressed in the Open Letter sent Feb. 25th, 2026 to the Mayor and Council by the highly knowledgeable and regarded members of the Housing Reset Group.</p> <p>I strongly urge the City to withdraw the Official Development Plan.</p> <p>A plan of this magnitude and significance to the long term future of Vancouver requires representative input from property owners and renters be they located within Transit Hubs, Neighbourhood Areas, Villages, etc. From what I have heard and read, it appears there is limited awareness and understanding of this plan and its long-term implications among residents of Vancouver.</p> <p>At a minimum, residents who live within the existing 22 neighbourhoods in Vancouver should be aware that approval of this plan could lead to a massive up-zoning to their areas just as residents of the Rupert and Renfrew area have recently learned. Please see Douglas Todd's Feb. 26th article in the Vancouver Sun for more details.</p>	Grant Mackay	Kerrisdale	
2026-03-10	00:57	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Mayor and Council: I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE ODP AND URGE MAYOR COUNCIL TO IMPLEMENT THE GRANDVIEW COMMUNITY PLAN that protects the heart and soul of the neighbourhood's character, with policies that:</p> <p>Enhance the eclectic nature of the Commercial Drive, East Hastings, and other shopping areas</p> <p>Create new housing opportunities while protecting the apartment stock, heritage buildings, and the social diversity of the area.</p> <p>Renew and improve public spaces, social and cultural amenities, and critical infrastructure.</p> <p>Support walking, biking, and public transit, and improved access to and through the community.</p> <p>The goal is for the community to continue to evolve as a mixed-income, socially-sensitive place that is transit-oriented and rich in heritage and culture. That's what the residents of Vancouver want. The City risks becoming a pipeline for capital rather than homes for people.</p>	Janice Whitehead	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-03-10	03:07	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>My name is Alison Bealy. I have been a renter in Vancouver for 40 years.</p> <p>I am opposed to the ODP plan as it stands.</p>	Alison Bealy	Dunbar-Southlands	

I am in complete agreement with the letter to the City that presumably you have all read...the letter signed by "The 30" (Metro Vancouver region-based urbanists, urban planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics, most with decades of experience, some with a background in development). I ask that you take their comments as seriously as I do, as many Vancouverites do.

I question the population forecast which is much greater than government sources show. I question the need to 'ramp up development' to push for greater density in every neighbourhood. We do have dense, vibrant neighbourhoods with people of all ages and incomes, renters and homeowners (for example, Kitsilano and Mount Pleasant).

The City used to talk of being a green city, used to talk of gentle densification. Now we seem to have abandoned green demolition (deconstruction and repurposing reclaimed materials). I see perfectly good houses crushed in a matter of hours before the lot is left to sit empty as if there was a need to rush..and there is no longer any pretense of gentle densification, the City now seeks to rezone the whole city to make way for the tsunami of development. All while reducing the possibility of public engagement.

I quote "The 30"

QUOTE Rather than a traditional approach of using regional population as allocated to the City, population additions have been determined by the capacity of the existing and new housing stock to accommodate people.

The City's needs assessment clarifies that the largest needs are for housing that is affordable to average and low wage worker incomes, especially larger units for families, but what is planned will not meet these needs. The ODP should address planning mechanisms to actually deliver housing that is economically accessible to mid and lower-income households in our City.

Instead, the City is creating far over capacity of market development beyond what is required for realistic population growth. This ODP would result in massive land inflation, speculation, and demolition of more existing affordable housing than it would build, displacing thousands of people. END QUOTE

I am saddened by the continued disregard for those of us who live here, who have made homes here, who connect with and contribute to our communities in favour of developers.

The City said neighbourhood plans are now redundant. The ODP now uses a broad-brush approach and seeks to redesign the city as clusters of building types, erasing the Vancouver we know with highrises the only option.

This broad-brush plan does not respect those who live here, those who love their neighbourhoods (and yes, I mean not only their own neighbourhoods).

I ask you to think of the neighbourhoods you live in, or visit -- whether to your favourite cafe, or park. Do you honestly think a sea of highrises will make it a better neighbourhood? Remember that new buildings are often built out to the sidewalk or very close to it -- that will mean a greatly reduced tree canopy. My first home in Vancouver was in the West End; even with highrises, because of the setbacks required there were many, many trees -- you never felt surrounded by, or dwarfed by highrises.

Why not develop to existing zoning. Why not build more low-rise courtyard style buildings including co-ops. Developments like Arbutus Walk are very livable and even allow for mature trees where some residents can enjoy cooling from shade rather than air-conditioning. This is what we should be aspiring to, not concrete towers to stack up the most number of people

				<p>possible (where developers seek ever-increased heights (even re-applying after receiving approval for lower heights). We CAN AND SHOULD do better.</p> <p>QUOTE All of the existing community, neighbourhood and area plans are headed for major revision or elimination altogether. Every area-wide or community plan will be amended to state that the ODP is the guiding policy document, making them effectively irrelevant.</p> <p>Instead of these community plan directions, they will be replaced with a limited number of housing typologies that are mostly apartments in towers of varying heights and a few areas left over of multiplexes. END QUOTE</p> <p>One might think the plan was for a city where none already existed.</p> <p>I implore you to reject the ODP as put forward by Planning Department.</p>			
2026-03-10	07:45	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I think it is very important for the public to have some avenue to weigh in on what is being developed in our city, especially when current council is headed by someone who is shady, lies, and seems to be doing back door handshakes. Hiding this process away will leave us open to more corruption.</p> <p>I am opposed</p>	Amy Salderman	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	08:13	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I'm opposed against six storeys building in quiet street. More densification but your plan is not covering more schools and day care</p>	France Harvey	Grandview-Woodland	

2026-03-10	09:20	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Subject: Opposition to Current Redevelopment Policies Due to Lack of Tenant Protections and Displacement Data</p> <p>To: Mayor and Council, City of Vancouver</p> <p>My name is Aissa and I am writing to formally oppose the City’s current approach to redevelopment policies (including the [Insert Specific Policy Name, e.g., ODP/ Broadway Plan]) until fundamental gaps in tenant protection are addressed. While the need for housing is urgent, we cannot allow poorly regulated redevelopment to worsen the housing crisis by displacing the very residents we aim to protect.</p> <p>1. The City is operating without critical data. The City should not adopt policies that increase redevelopment pressure without first publishing reliable, audited data on demovictions and tenant displacement. Currently, we are being asked to accept sweeping land-use changes without clear evidence regarding where renters are being pushed out and what happens to them afterward. Policy decisions must be based on concrete evidence regarding renter displacement and housing outcomes, not speculation. We need to know the true toll of redevelopment before we accelerate it.</p> <p>2. These policies invite financialization, not housing stability. The proposed density and land assembly incentives within the [ODP/Plan Name] are structured in a way that attracts speculative investment and financialized housing models. Without strict safeguards, we are prioritizing global capital markets over local communities. We must ensure that new housing serves residents—teachers, seniors, and working families—rather than acting as a commodity for institutional investors. The City must embed binding safeguards that prioritize long-term affordability over short-term profit extraction.</p> <p>3. Equity and community stability are being traded for units. Redevelopment is not neutral; it actively displaces our most vulnerable neighbors. Renters—including seniors, newcomers, and low-income households—bear the brunt of these policies. Planning decisions must prioritize housing stability and community continuity over the mere tally of new units. A policy that builds 100 units but displaces 50 existing households is a net loss for community well-being.</p> <p>I urge you to pause the adoption of this policy until we have the data to understand the impact and the tools to guarantee that existing renters are protected.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	Aissa Aggoune		
2026-03-10	09:41	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Associations Presidents Group (APG) mycommunitycentre.com</p> <p>March 8, 2026</p> <p>To: City of Vancouver Mayor Sim and Councillors</p> <p>Dear Mayor Sim and Councillors,</p> <p>Re: City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Public Hearing March 10, 2026</p> <p>The Associations Presidents Group (APG) has representation from 19 Community Centre Associations (CCAs) citywide, who operate their community centres through a Joint Operating Agreement (JOA) with the Park Board. We have major concerns about the proposed Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) and request reconsideration with broader community consultation</p>	Jerry Fast		

of the ODP before adoption.

We note that the CCAs and their individual communities have generally not been broadly engaged in meaningful consultation by the City in the Vancouver Plan or the Official Development Plan processes.

Our main concern is that this large increase in development and population growth is not aligned with equivalent increases in infrastructure, parks, schools and amenities. In particular our focus is on our mandate for community centre facilities, programs and related parks in each of our communities.

The City has been underfunding the Park Board for decades, even to keep up with the current population and needs of our communities. The City is not fully funding the Community Centre Strategy approved in 2022, or the VanPlay recommendations for the Parks and Recreation system generally, much less for the proposed increase of population in the ODP of about 250,000 additional people.

Community Centre Requirements to Meet Future Growth

The VanPlay and Community Centre Strategy have a policy to ..." Keep up with population growth by increasing the access to facilities; for example, aim to maintain the current citywide ratio of 1.2 sq. ft. of multifunctional community centre space (excluding rinks and pools) per person as the population grows."

For the Vancouver Official Development Plan proposed population growth of approximately 250,000 people, that would require an additional 300,000 sq. ft. of community centre space.

There is no meaningful proposal in this ODP plan to meet these needs.

Our Community Centres are Already Falling Behind

There are 27 community centres across the city. According to the Community Centre Strategy adopted in 2022 "...the average age of community centres in Vancouver is approximately 46 years old (18 of the 27 community centres in Vancouver were built prior to 1990). Over half of the community centre inventory in Vancouver is categorized as being in "poor" or "very poor" condition."

Eleven of the 27 community centres in the city were identified as requiring renewal within the next 20 years (from 2022). This is on top of deferred maintenance on all of the facilities.

But that isn't happening.

Of the four centres confirmed for renewal - Ray-Cam, Britannia, West End and Marpole - only Marpole is under construction, while the others await funding. Of the four highest ranked for needing renewal - Kensington, Renfrew, Hastings and Strathcona - only Hastings is now a priority to go ahead but isn't fully funded. We are very concerned that those slated for renewal in the upcoming capital plan are unlikely to receive funding due to Council's chronic underfunding of the Park Board and given the current approved City budget.

The Park Board estimates it requires far more funding annually than it receives to maintain existing community centres and for needed renewals.

The Vancouver Plan and ODP contain aspirational sections recognizing the importance of community centres as "essential hubs for community life, health and play." But as Council is about to vote on a plan that could vastly expand housing and density, there is no realistic strategy for adequately maintaining existing centres or expanding them to keep up with the needs of a growing population.

Aspirations require actions. Our concern is this: If nothing changes, in 20 years we will have a city whose community centres are overwhelmed, underfunded, and in serious disrepair.

In conclusion, we request reconsideration of the ODP to better align growth and community centre infrastructure and amenities, with broader community consultation of the ODP before adoption, and improved resources to the Park Board to meet current needs and future growth plan projections.

Sincerely,  
  
Jerry Fast, Chair  
Associations Presidents Group (APG)

Member Community Centre Associations: Champlain Heights Community Association, Douglas Park Community Association, Dunbar Community Centre Association, False Creek Community Association, Hastings Community Association, Kerrisdale Community Centre Society, Killarney Community Centre Society, Kitsilano Community Centre Association, Marpole-Oakridge Community Association, Mount Pleasant Community Centre Association, Renfrew Park Community Association, Riley Park Hillcrest Community Association, Roundhouse Community Arts & Recreation Society, Strathcona Community Centre Association, Sunset Community Association, Thunderbird Neighbourhood Association, Trout Lake Community Centre Association, West End Community Centre Association, West Point Grey Community Centre Association

2026-03-10	10:34	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Firstly, I recognize that city staff and council will ignore any opposition as has been the pattern over the past 2 1/2 years. It is quite disheartening as a voter.</p> <p>And now my comments about the application itself:</p> <p>1. Questionable Population and Unit Projection Methodology</p> <p>One of the main issues is that there has been a major shift of how the Vancouver ODP and Regional Context Statement calculate population and unit growth projections.</p> <p>Typically, the regional growth projections for Vancouver are used to determine the number of units required to meet that growth over a given period in the ODP, in this case to 2050. Metro Vancouver is responsible for regional projections and BC Stats does both provincial and regional projections based on data from StatsCan Census and federal immigration estimates, among other data sources. Metro Vancouver works with both the province and member municipalities in determining regional and municipal projections. For example see: <a href="https://metrovancover[.]org/boards/RegionalPlanning/RPL-2025-09-11-OT.pdf">https://metrovancover[.]org/boards/RegionalPlanning/RPL-2025-09-11-OT.pdf</a></p> <p>However, it is unclear why a real estate firm's advice, Rennie, is included in the ODP report as Appendix G. This is highly unusual. These real-estate firm projections are adopted as the City's official projections that are substantially higher than the regional projections for the City of Vancouver.</p> <p>Rather than a traditional approach of using regional population as allocated to the City, population additions have been determined by the capacity of the existing and new housing stock to accommodate people.</p> <p>Basically, build it and they will come. So the tail is wagging the dog, with the development pipeline dictating the expected population growth. This pipeline of already approved projects, and not considering much of the high zoned capacity, does not adjust for the reduction in immigration and the severe economic downturn cycle with ballooning existing supply of new units that are not being absorbed.</p> <p>There is a great deal of uncertainty related to population projections at present given that they are strongly influenced by immigration levels and intra- and inter provincial migration. The ODP does not address how, for example, a significant downward shift in population growth would impact Plan content. Current regional projections show a decrease of population for 2026 before resuming to typical average growth of about 1% per year. But again, it is highly uncertain how long this economic growth correction will last.</p> <p>2. Excessive Development Without Affordability</p> <p>The Rennie growth analysis as shown in Appendix G of the Council report, shows that while just using the development already approved and in the pipeline, the whole growth projected to 2050 could be built out by 2034.</p> <p>This would suggest that no additional development is needed to be approved beyond what is already in the pipeline, making the further development in the ODP unnecessary. However, most of what is in the development pipeline is small expensive units in large towers, not what is actually needed.</p> <p>The City's needs assessment clarifies that the largest needs are for housing that is affordable to average and low wage worker incomes, especially larger units for families, but what is planned will not meet these needs. The ODP should address planning mechanisms to actually deliver housing that is economically accessible to mid and lower-income households</p>	Karen Webber	Mount Pleasant
------------	-------	---	--------	---	--------------	----------------

in our City.

Instead, the City is creating far over capacity of market development beyond what is required for realistic population growth. This ODP would result in massive land inflation, speculation, and demolition of more existing affordable housing than it would build, displacing thousands of people.

3. Inadequate Infrastructure, Parks, Recreation, Schools and Amenities

The ODP includes almost no increased infrastructure, parks, recreation, schools and amenities for the massive increase in projected population growth, or any additional funding resources to support it.

This will particularly affect many neighbourhoods that are already underserved yet are slated for massive growth under the ODP.

For example, the School Board is being forced by the Province to reduce the number of schools in Vancouver and won't plan for population growth until children are actually registered and on wait lists. Even then, as we are seeing with the Olympic Village that has been completed for over 15 years without a school, the province is just not providing the resources to support this growth.

The Park Board is chronically underfunded to meet current needs and there is nothing in this plan for upgrades of existing or proposed future expansion to meet the increased growth.

4. Loss of Participatory Planning, Neighbourhood Context, and Transparent Approvals Process

All of the existing community, neighbourhood and area plans are headed for major revision or elimination altogether. Every area-wide or community plan will be amended to state that the ODP is the guiding policy document, making them effectively irrelevant.

Instead of these community plan directions, they will be replaced with a limited number of housing typologies that are mostly apartments in towers of varying heights and a few areas left over of multiplexes.

Gone will be any of the heritage or character retention zones that incentivized multifamily conversions and infill. Or carefully planned ground oriented family housing that suits a specific local context.

Any rezoning, whether for a single lot or whole neighbourhood area wide, that is consistent with the new ODP will not require a public hearing going forward. Less to no public involvement in the future of their neighbourhood. No consideration of local context or livability. Fortunes made, neighbourhoods ruined.

This is the new world of one-size-fits-all zoning based on a limited choice of basic building form typologies.

Most development will be processed almost exclusively by unaccountable staff, exercising discretion, out of the public eye (and Council's), and with fewer written records. It is even staff discretion as to if there will be a development sign on the property so the surrounding community knows there is an application in process.

Such an approach provides opportunity for mistakes, favouritism, and even corruption.

5. Excessive Literal Implementation of Provincial Mandates

				<p>The City of Vancouver cannot solely blame the BC zoning bills for this one-size-fits-all approach; the Vancouver Plan already promoted this strategy. The City is now implementing the BC zoning bills very literally and even surpassing the minimum requirements of the legislation.</p> <p>The City could instead be joining other municipalities in requesting a judicial review of the BC jurisdictional overreach, lack of due process or procedural fairness, lack of resources for infrastructure and amenities for the provincial mandates, and the impractical one-size-fits-all approach throughout the province.</p> <p>The City need not wait on the Province and could instead be taking the lead to properly plan with meaningful community involvement for the future of the city and defending the public interest now.</p> <p>It is our understanding that the Province is having to be lenient with the previously imposed June 2026 deadline for OCP / ODP adoption so there is no need for Council to rush this through well in advance.</p> <p>In conclusion, I urge the City to withdraw the Official Development Plan (ODP) and refer it back to staff for reconsideration through a democratic participatory planning process that prioritizes planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods with a truly sustainable future. The Vancouver Official Development Plan should have pervasive public participation that is reflected in this plan's final development, before adoption.</p>			
2026-03-10	11:08	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Please consider joining View Royal to challenge the provincial government's overstepping into municipal jurisdictions.</p> <p>Vancouver has ocean, views, mountains, clean air, walkability, and livability. We are internationally recognized for our clean air and livability. Do not destroy our city by making this aggressive Official Development Plan. The city is already getting full of brand new vacant towers. If we densify without hesitation, Vancouver will just be another gross ugly city like many others I have chosen not to live in. Please be like View Royal, BC and challenge the provincial requirement.</p> <p>I also feel strongly that Mayor Sim, Councilor Jang and the ABC Party should not be allowed to make any large decisions about the ODP, and that the ODP should at least be tabled until after the next municipal election. Please vote this down or table it.</p>	Patricia Gooch	West End	
2026-03-10	11:38	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The New ODP of Vancouver is a Vancouver version of "Blanket Rezoning" Policy in Calgary. The General manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability of CoV is the architect of both polices.</p> <p>A public hearing for repelling the " Blanket rezoning "policy in Calgary Council on March 23 2026.</p>	Jeff Ang	South Cambie	

2026-03-10	11:39	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>March 10, 2026</p> <p>City of Vancouver</p> <p>Dear Mayor Sim and Council,</p> <p>Re: Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) Public Hearing</p> <p>The West Point Grey Residents Association (WPGRA) is STRONGLY OPPOSED to approval of the proposed Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP).</p> <p>We are part of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) and support their letter with our citywide concerns. <a href="https://coalitionvan.org/posts/20260310-cvn-to-official-development-plan-odp/">https://coalitionvan.org/posts/20260310-cvn-to-official-development-plan-odp/</a></p> <p>We remain strongly opposed to the ODP that has not responded to neighbourhood or broader public feedback in the Vancouver Plan or draft ODP. There has been no meaningful public involvement in any of this plan.</p> <p>From a local community perspective, we are very concerned that the Urban Structures Strategy (formerly called the Urban Growth Strategy in the Vancouver Plan) turns all of Kitsilano and West Point Grey into a transit oriented development corridor, similar to the Broadway Plan.</p> <p>We also are concerned that the Vancouver Official Development Plan now incorporates the Jericho Lands ODP, thereby solidifying it into regional planning. See the reference link below regarding our continued concerns about the Jericho Lands ODP.</p> <p>We request that this Vancouver Official Development Plan not be approved as proposed, and instead refer it back to staff for broader public participatory neighbourhood based planning. Vancouver is a city of neighbourhoods, not the same building typologies spread randomly across the city. Vancouver needs to take a different approach for a livable and affordable future.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>West Point Grey Residents Association Board of Directors</p> <p>Reference: WPGRA Related Letter to Council Link for the Jericho Lands ODP: <a href="https://wpgra.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/wpgra-jericho-lands-odp-public-hearing-2025-04-15-final.pdf">https://wpgra.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/wpgra-jericho-lands-odp-public-hearing-2025-04-15-final.pdf</a></p>	organization West Point Grey Residents Association (WPGRA)	West Point Grey	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-03-10	11:42	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Please see the attached comments regarding the City of Vancouver Official Development Plan.	Kirsten Severson		<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-03-10	11:46	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>I have been advocating for a reboot of the CityPlan process since 2005.</p> <p>The original CityPlan in the 1990s engaged more than 100,000 Vancouver residents — before the internet. It was rooted in neighbourhood-based planning and recognized that Vancouver is a city of communities, each with its own character and needs.</p> <p>Over decades, planners and residents together developed neighbourhood plans and community visions that balanced housing, transportation, amenities, greenspace, and</p>	Colleen Hardwick	Kitsilano	

economic activity.

It was participatory planning at its best.

When I ran for Council in 2018, I campaigned on rebooting CityPlan to continue that legacy.

Instead, Council launched what became the Vancouver Plan.

Rather than building on neighbourhood planning, the Vancouver Plan took a top-down approach, applying development typologies across the city with little regard for local context.

Neighbourhoods were barely mentioned.

Public engagement became largely symbolic, and residents were increasingly dismissed as impediments.

But Vancouver is not a blank slate.

It is a city built by generations of residents who care deeply about their communities.

Planning must also be evidence-based.

Throughout my time on Council, I repeatedly asked for the housing data behind the City's growth assumptions — including existing zoned capacity, development pipelines, rental supply, and population projections.

That data was never fully provided.

Without transparent data, planning becomes aspiration rather than analysis.

The Official Development Plan now before Council stems directly from this flawed Vancouver Plan framework.

It continues to rely on expanding development entitlements in ways that inflate land values and displace residents without addressing the fundamental challenge of affordability.

Vancouver absolutely needs a citywide plan.

But that plan must build on the decades of neighbourhood planning that shaped this city and reflect genuine public participation.

For that reason, I urge Council to withdraw the Official Development Plan and refer it back to staff for reconsideration through a truly democratic planning process.

Because Vancouver is not a blank slate.

It is a city of neighbourhoods.

And neighbourhoods deserve a voice in their future.

Thank you.

City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	12:26	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the City of Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) as proposed. I urge Council to refer this back to staff for reconsideration through a meaningful public participatory process, before adoption. We need more of a focus on city planners integrating essential community services along with livability and affordable housing and less planning that blindly supports developers leading the charge to simply build more housing without actual infrastructure to support it. In our neighbourhood we already have a new school that can accommodate less students than the school it replaced with locals being unable to attend and your intent is now to build 6 storey apartments and increase demand even further?!</p> <p>The ODP continues to rely on flawed principles of primarily promoting more supply entitlements that inflate land values, and displace thousands of residents, without addressing the fundamental lack of affordable housing. This is doing more harm than good. This plan promotes excessive development without affordability, inadequate infrastructure, parks and schools and the loss of participatory planning, neighbourhood context and transparent approvals process.</p> <p>Please withdraw the plan and refer it back to staff for reconsideration through a democratic planning process that prioritizes planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods with a truly sustainable future.</p>	Emma Harvey	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-03-10	12:52	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am vehemently OPPOSED to the proposed ODP for these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* I endorse the cogent open letter from 30 expert Vancouver urbanists, urban planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics summarizing their reasons for opposing ODP at <a href="https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/">https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/</a></li> <li>* ODP's population projections &amp; housing needs NOT based on StatsCan &amp; BCStats data; instead based on inflated real estate developer projection (huge conflict of interest)</li> <li>* ODP will result in oversupply of unaffordable, non-family size units. There are already sufficient units in supply pipeline, especially given decreased immigration &amp; economic downturn</li> <li>* ODP does not adequately provide for residents' needs: INSUFFICIENT infrastructure, parks, recreation facilities, schools &amp; amenities are planned for huge population increase. NO funding resources are provided to create future infrastructure</li> <li>* Multiple concrete towers will require infrastructure upgrades (electrical grid; water supply; sewage) as current infrastructure cannot handle future burden</li> <li>* Decades of plans created through public input for existing neighbourhoods will be eliminated destroying neighbourhoods and heritage character areas</li> <li>* Public hearings &amp; input re new developments will be virtually eliminated &amp; impossible</li> <li>* Vancouver 's liveability and natural beauty will be destroyed by predominance of towers</li> <li>* ODP will destroy heritage character areas and current interesting shopping areas in favour of bland homogenized modernity</li> <li>* Climate change is occurring. Vancouver will experience more heat domes; people living in concrete towers will be trapped in overheated spaces</li> <li>* ODP will promote loss of tree canopy which is crucial to counteract increased heat due to climate change; towers are too tall to benefit from trees cooling effects</li> <li>* Residents' mental &amp; physical health will suffer with inadequate parks &amp; recreation to escape small living spaces</li> <li>* As towers predominate, uplifting views &amp; light will be diminished exacerbating depression during dark &amp; rainy weather 4 months annually under new Pacific Time</li> </ul>	Anna Holeton	Fairview	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	13:09	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I very strongly support the submission by the Housing Reset group of thirty well-known and respected local experts. Withdraw the proposed plan and think again! Use the expertise readily available here and also meaningfully consult with citizens city-wide. These proposals should be headlines in local news, not ideas circulated mainly among those on the city's own mailing lists.</p> <p>I support all the proposals put forward by the Housing Reset group. I also want to emphasize my own deep concern for the city of Vancouver as a beautiful, exceptional and unique Canadian icon, blessed by nature and especially remarkable for its urban forest - which will not survive the proposed onslaught of destruction and overbuilding. In addition, the new proposal is alarmingly inadequate in planning for schools, parks, and other amenities needed for the next generation, Meanwhile, existing neighbourhood shopping areas are wasting away while city planners re-draw neighbourhoods. The proposed plan will destroy much of Vancouver's unique appeal while creating a city like too many others, bereft of its unique personality and truly amazing trees, which are even now being unceremoniously destroyed in backyards and frontyards city-wide.</p> <p>Send the proposed ODP back to staff, and consult seriously with citizens and particularly with the experts among us as exemplified by the Housing Reset experts.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	Joan Bunn	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	13:19	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I moved from Toronto to Vancouver because truly livable places were few and far between. In Toronto, we couldn't find an affordable two-bedroom that could accommodate an office for both my husband and me—since we work from home. I also had no desire to live in a large building and rely on an elevator just to let our dog out. Fortunately, when we moved to Vancouver, we found a small four-story building with a shared courtyard. It's easy to let the dog out, and we have wonderful neighbors.</p> <p>The idea of turning this city into a more "Toronto-like" place—with large, uninspiring buildings—is deeply troubling. Canada is already expensive, the weather isn't ideal, and younger people are looking elsewhere to live. Continuing down this path, turning Vancouver into an overpriced concrete jungle, will drive people away permanently—to the U.S., where opportunities and quality of life are better. Small buildings for the win! If you can't take a dog out without relying on an elevator, don't build it. It's that simple.</p>	Julie Posluns	Kitsilano	<a href="#">Attachment 1</a>
2026-03-10	13:46	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Surely by now you see the density Plan is already not working. Empty condos. Failing businesses. Rents not going down. Chaos everywhere. Please, stop the bulldozers and hand the reins over to the huge numbers of experts with tremendous experience and knowledge who are pleading with you to listen as they are actually trying to Help, offering better ways to Both create new And save what we most value. The hearts &amp; spirits of the world are being broken everywhere. Don't let our city and our beautiful parks &amp; beaches be destroyed.</p>	Janet Miller	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	13:47	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Mayor and Council need to be listening to it's residents, stop overbuilding neighbourhoods. The height of towers needs to be brought way down, unless you want Vancouver to resemble Hong Kong and not world famous, scenic Vancouver. Anything over 8 stories should be kept to main arteries - Granville, Broadway, etc. NOT neighbourhood side streets !</p>	Mathew Littledale	Kitsilano	Appendix A
2026-03-10	14:00	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. am opposed to to the procedural change proposed that will reduce or eliminate public hearings regarding developments in the future.</li> <li>2. I am opposed to the the Broadway plan as the the future plan for Kitsilano and lands on Vancouvers west side where skyscrapers will be built in low lying areas obliterating the view of the water for all those living farther away from the water. Density can be increased in a terraced fashion.</li> <li>3. I am very concerned about the Jericho land development in particular because of the above reason but also because we don't have the infrastructure for such extreme high density.</li> </ol>	Esther Reid	West Point Grey	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	14:09	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Too dense too fast for the Jericho area.	John Camfield	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	14:11	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Please see attached document.  N. Alexander	Nancy Alexander	Kitsilano	Appendix B
2026-03-10	14:13	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Too dense too fast for the Jericho area	Jane Camfield	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	14:17	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I endorse the open letter from 30 expert Vancouver urbanists, urban planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics summarizing their opposition of ODP.	Jim McKay		
2026-03-10	14:19	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	More consultation needed - you can't just withdraw this right.	Chris Benn	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	14:21	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I endorse the open letter from 30 expert Vancouver urbanists, urban planners, architects, and UBC/SFU academics summarizing their opposition of ODP.	Dianna McKay	Fairview	
2026-03-10	14:27	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I totally disapprove the development as planned: 20+ stories towers because: expensive to rent (only a few apartments for social housing), ugly, disruptive to the community , noisy to build (not livable for the people housed nearby, who should be compensated or relocated for the duration of the constructions), will attract more traffic, much more noise in general, much more dangerous in case of a major earthquake, would block the view that makes Vancouver so special, would require more parking, parks, schools, community centres, grocery stores (etc.) which would mean even more destruction and construction, etc. Vancouver has still many vacant buildings (houses and apartments) which should be targeted first to provide more housing. New towers up to 7 stories max would meet housing needed and would not upset so many residents. Everyone I talked to about the plan is against such towers coming out of nowhere, planned without any vision, aesthetic . Many people are leaving the areas or if they stay, it is because they have no other option. I feel for the people who are/will be evicted, many of them elderly and single parent families. Please don't built for the sake of building. 10+ stories towers don't belong to the North side of Broadway (past Burrard Ave to UBC). Instead, please focus on empty buildings. That should be your priority.	Martine Wakefield	Arbutus Ridge	
2026-03-10	14:31	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	This is not what the people want. Developers, sure, but what they're building are not liveable, rentable spaces. The plan is way too final, and needs proper consultation.	Co Miller	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	14:31	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Listen to what the residents and experts are telling you! Healthy, livable neighborhoods are what makes this city great. A healthy environment is everything.....protect heritage neighborhoods and green space. Once it is gone you never get it back! This is Vancouver.... not Singapore or Dubai. No more towers.....enough!!!	Mary MacDonald	Kitsilano	

2026-03-10	14:32	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>My name is Evelyn Jacob and I oppose the Official Development Plan as proposed.</p> <p>One of my main concerns is that the plan places more importance on giving developers what they want rather than what citizens want and need in their own neighbourhoods. The ODP proposal, as the publication CityHallWatch has noted, "will have far reaching impacts for generations by shaping Vancouver into a city of generic tower typology rather than distinct neighbourhoods."</p> <p>According to the Plan, Our city will continue to be filled with expensive towers with tiny rooms rather than a variety of homes, including ground-oriented and affordable housing.</p> <p>In the past, neighbourhoods were included in the housing planning process. Now, we are being asked to put our faith in developers and planners to decide what is best for us. Recent media stories about development mismanagement at the local level that has cost tax payers dearly, and broken trust between the City and the citizens.</p> <p>The "build more" argument in the proposed OCP is weak at best. We already have Senakw, Jericho Lands, Heather Lands, and Oakridge which will already provide enough or more housing than we need. There is much more to say about the ODP but the most important question we must ask ourselves is, Do we have enough trust in developers and local planning officials to get it right? I'm afraid I will have to give this plan a NO vote.</p>	Evelyn Jacob	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	14:35	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The many defects of this Vancouver Official Development Plan have been well laid out in a recent letter to you from the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods — please see attached. Accordingly, I request that this Plan not be approved as proposed, and instead be referred back to staff for more participatory and neighbourhood-based planning.</p>	Susan Tha	West Point Grey	Appendix C
2026-03-10	14:45	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>This plan walks back everything that is great about Vancouver. If the only objective is to increase housing supply, it will work simply because no one will want to live here anymore. Please don't do it!!</p>	Mary Blachut	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	14:46	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>See online: <a href="https://coalitionvan.org/posts/20260310-cvn-to-official-development-plan-odp/">https://coalitionvan.org/posts/20260310-cvn-to-official-development-plan-odp/</a> City of Vancouver</p> <p>The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) is opposed to the Official Development Plan (ODP). While we recognize the need for citywide planning, we are greatly concerned about both the process this has undertaken and the proposed ODP content.</p> <p>Process: First, we would like to address the process. Both the ODP and Vancouver Plan have not had meaningful public engagement or consultation that has instead focused on development industry and related groups interests.</p> <p>Even though the ODP has such a major impact on the city for the future, there have been no mail out notices of this public hearing to the 100,000 properties citywide affected by this plan. Only the very minimum for a public hearing notice, and even that is questionable given that the City posted the wrong version of the referral report on the public hearing page up to only four business days before the hearing.</p> <p>The general public is largely unaware of the Vancouver Plan or the ODP. The very limited engagement on the Vancouver Plan did not address the many concerns raised by the public, including our comments. There was only one draft ODP engagement in October 2025. It was 204 pages, much of it technical, with many other related documents and displays, but the public was only given about two weeks to review and ask questions. Only four poorly advertised and lightly attended open houses for the whole city over the two weeks. Again,</p>	Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods CVN		Appendix D

no mail out notices to the affected properties.

The Vancouver Plan Urban Growth Strategy map has now been relabelled as Urban Structure Strategy. This is misleading since it is in fact the transit oriented development urban growth for the future and is buried in the document as if it is inconsequential.

Most people who look at this document, if they see it at all, they will have no idea what it all means to them or the future of the city. In fact, our groups and members are still struggling to understand it all.

Our previous draft ODP comments and concerns have not been addressed in the current ODP referral report and can be found here for reference.

This is not a legitimate process for the only public hearing on this substantive plan . Once adopted, there will be no further public hearings on any rezonings consistent with the ODP Generalized Land Use provisions.

Here is a small selection of our many previous concerns with the Vancouver Plan and draft ODP, that now also apply to the ODP public hearing as follows:

1. No Neighbourhood-based Planning - One Size Fits All  
Policies are too broad-brushed and rely on a one-size-fits-all approach. The Urban Structures / Urban Growth plan draws lines on the map of Vancouver in swaths of mauve and purple showing large areas of the city scheduled for redevelopment — yet each neighbourhood is unique. Areas where added density can work may be in smaller pockets in particular parts of a neighbourhood. The draft plan places too much emphasis on increasing the number of housing units, and not enough on different types of housing. Neighbourhood-based planning from the ground up would have procured opportunities for densification that respect existing neighbourhoods and fit into the local context. The ODP plan, if approved, results in repealing/amending all existing neighbourhood Community Plans and Community Visions, which were based on years of neighbourhood involvement and extensive participation done in good faith. Excessive literal implementation of the BC zoning bills goes far beyond provincial mandates and is unnecessary to meet population growth projections.
2. Lack of Urban Design  
The plan does not prioritize good urban design. Some of the suggestions, like six storeys in shopping districts purportedly to preserve sunlight access but 12 storeys along residential streets, minimize the impact of high buildings on sunlight and livability on shopping, but not on living. Former senior planners with the City are expressing their concerns over poor urban design. Ralph Segal says, "...approval of the Vancouver Plan and its approach to planning and affordable housing, will nail it as a disaster." (<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/vancouver/article-generation-density-past-planners-speak-out-on-urban-development/>) We are seeing this in the Broadway Plan area that is now part of the ODP, and is being spread throughout the city.
3. Excessive Population Targets  
The population targets chosen are too high and the plan does not give enough recognition to possible changes in economic conditions currently underway and over the next thirty years. The Region has provided updated population growth projections to 2050 for the City of Vancouver as of September 2025, with a low of 130,000, mid of 195,000 and high growth of 252,000 people. However, Rennie in Appendix G of the report, states "...rather than a traditional approach of using regional population as allocated to the City, population additions have been determined by the capacity of the existing and new housing stock to accommodate people." This is a major unusual shift. And they assume much higher growth of 271,000, the highest option, and far beyond the historical average increase of 1% per year. And they show that the entire projected growth to 2050 could be accommodated by

the development currently already approved and in the pipeline. this puts in question the need for so much new growth in the ODP. Such a high target puts more and more pressure on neighbourhoods and infrastructure to absorb more and more housing.

4. Lack of Consideration of Existing Capacity

The plan includes very little recognition of existing capacity in existing zoning, and of the potential population increase in large sites and projects already being planned, such as Jericho Lands, Heather Lands, , Seňákw, Rupert station, or Cambie Corridor. It also fails to consider the massive increases of development in the ODP of primarily apartment buildings from 6 storeys to high towers, and the change to allow new duplexes in RS zones, now increased to multiplexes in R1-1.

5. Too many Rental Towers (mainly for REITs) and too little Ground-Oriented Family Housing

The plan does not give enough consideration of different types of housing, including ownership, co-op, and rental, that will be needed over the next 30 years for families, as well as single people and couples.

As the years pass, more and more single people who currently seek apartment rentals will be forming families and wanting housing that is ground-oriented and large enough for a family with one or two children to live in over the long term. Many will want the chance to buy a home or a co-op unit where they can feel securely housed.

Over and over in the plan, planners prioritize rental and social housing, with an excessive emphasis on the tower form. There are very small number of areas left in the city proposed for multiplexes that do not currently have towers (such as the RT character areas of Kitsilano, Grandview-Woodlands and Mount Pleasant) and the RT zones are being eliminated. Even in the multiplex areas, planners also leave open the option for apartments, thereby undermining the potential for multiplexes to be built.

6. No Policy for Heritage Buildings and Character Retention Incentives Undermined

The plan makes no clear statement or indication that buildings on the Heritage Register (whether or not legally designated as heritage) will be protected from demolition and redevelopment. The plan offers very little recognition or emphasis on the city’s heritage buildings, and no strategy as to how they can be retained. The plan mentions making the Heritage Register more equitable but offers no description of what that might entail. By adding so much new larger development it undermines current character house retention incentives, increases in embodied carbon, and loss of neighbourhood character and streetscapes. There is still no option to add two secondary suites as an incentive for character house retention.

7. Not Enough Provision of Green Space (Private and Public)

There is not enough consideration given to the serious impacts of redevelopment proposed by the plan on green space and tree canopy, with implications for carbon capture, rain runoff and the urban heat island.

8. Embodied Emissions

The plan does not adequately consider carbon footprints and embodied emissions associated with new development, especially the use of concrete and glass in new tower buildings. It offers no consideration of policies to actually mitigate embodied emissions.  
<https://vancouver.sun.com/opinion/columnists/douglas-todd-the-hidden-climate-costs-of-b-c-s-burgeoning-high-rises-part-ii>

9. City Services

The plan contains no significant consideration of how the City will provide the amenities, green space, and services such as schools, that will be needed if the population expands to meet targets stated in the plan. There appears to be no acknowledgement that the need for green space and community centres will increase even more due to high density tower development.

10. Lack of Social License

There were no advertisements, articles, or notices in newspapers or other mainstream media that the Vancouver Plan came to Council on July 6, 2022, in the middle of the summer when people are on holidays right before the election in October 2022. Then it was a landslide election, wiping out almost all of previous council, clearly signalling a desire for change. Unfortunately, the public did not get that change. Instead the ODP is now just a repeat of the same plan but worse, and again only two weeks to respond to the huge draft ODP without any public notices mailed or meaningful opportunities for public input or consultation.

At the time of the Vancouver Plan, the Ipsos Read Survey referred to in the report is the only randomized survey that has been conducted with under 200 people. Only 15% of the respondents said that they strongly support the Land Use Strategy. Everyone else had some or many concerns. Throughout the Vancouver Plan process the level of public support was misrepresented. The ODP process relies almost exclusively on this prior Vancouver Plan process.

We would also like to voice our support for the HousingReset.ca letter from the 30 urbanists, urban planners, architects and UBC/SFU academics, with decades of experience. They raise many important issues with the ODP, that also reflect our concerns. file:///C:/Users/Owner/Downloads/2026-02-25-housingreset-cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp-ph-1-2.pdf

Please do not approve this flawed plan. Instead, refer this back to staff for a participatory public process to reflect meaningful local neighbourhood based planning in the ODP. Provide for realistic population growth, and strive for: livability in the context of local character; address environmental impacts; include measures to avoid displacement from existing relatively affordable housing; and give adequate consideration to more affordable housing options, including ground-oriented housing for families, co-ops, and other models for both renters and owners, with amenities and adequate infrastructure in each neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairs Larry Bengé & Dorothy Barkley  
CVN Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

- Arbutus Ridge Community Association
- Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours
- Dunbar Residents Association
- Fairview/South Granville Action Committee
- Grandview Woodland Area Council
- Greater Yaletown Community Association
- Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association
- Kits Point Residents Association
- NW Point Grey Home Owners Association
- Oakridge Langara Area Residents
- Residents Association Mount Pleasant
- Riley Park/South Cambie Advisory Group
- Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc.
- Strathcona Residents Association
- Upper Kitsilano Residents Association
- West End Neighbours Society

				West Kitsilano Residents Association West Point Grey Residents Association West Southland Residents Association			
2026-03-10	14:54	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I think this plan will destroy neighbourhoods for all the reasons that have been outlined on numerous occasions to the City	Patricia Carlton	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	14:58	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Consultation is essential - let's keep things transparent. These massive projects with multiple skyscrapers are not helping the people of Vancouver. We need a say in all projects.	Erica Holdaway	Riley Park	
2026-03-10	14:59	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I am very concerned that adoption of the City of Vancouver Official Development Plan will strip away the democratic rights of all Vancouver citizens to participate in major decisions about the development of our neighbourhoods. I support the concerns outlined in the Open Letter posted to the website housingreset.ca and join the group in their request to council to refer the plan back to city staff for reconsideration and for greater public engagement.</p> <p>I strongly believe that the City needs to create better affordable housing options to make it possible for families, young people and newcomers to live in Vancouver and I also believe the Official Development Plan will not achieve these objectives. Instead of allowing developers to set the agenda and dictate the kinds of housing made available, I urge Council to be more creative and humane in their decisions by mandating "gentle density" and more emphasis on low-income, social, non-profit and co-operative housing.</p> <p>I am pleased to see increasing opposition to planned high-rises in well-established neighbourhoods like Kitsilano and Mount Pleasant, particularly the area close to City Hall. It is heart-breaking to contemplate the changes these proposed high-rises will bring to the character of these neighbourhoods and others around the City. Closer to my home, the profusion of low and mid-rise developments around E. Broadway &amp; Nanaimo are welcome (although I would again prefer to see more emphasis placed on greater affordability), as are the multi-unit buildings sprouting up all around me. However, I dread the proposed high-rise development planned closer to Renfrew and Rupert, not to mention those approved at Broadway and Commercial, which is one of the reasons I am urging a reconsideration of the ODA.</p> <p>In closing, I would like to bring Council's attention to an article I happened to read online in Business Insider by Joey Hadden "I'm a New Yorker who went to Vancouver for the first time. 7 things surprised me". She states that she had assumed the loss of more natural escapes within a city were the price you paid for a convenient urban lifestyle but she was delighted to discover that in Vancouver you could have both. "From the downtown area to the quieter surrounding neighbourhoods, various tree types stood as tall as the buildings, if not taller. There was no shortage of shade, and looking over the city from hilltops and hotel balconies, I could see how forests were embedded throughout the skyline." She concludes by saying she could see herself moving to Vancouver at some point in the future. I fear that by the time she makes her move, many of these trees will either be torn down or dwarfed by high rises and the ideal city she has daydreamed about inhabiting will have been ruined by this current City Council unless you reconsider the Official Development Plan.</p> <p>We can provide the housing we need for the future and keep the quintessential things that make Vancouver so desirable like neighbourhoods with character, parks and soaring tree canopies. We can make it possible for concerned citizens to contribute to the future of the City. But not if we continue with the Official Development Plan.</p>	Roxanne Cave	Grandview-Woodland	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	14:59	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor and Council,</p> <p>Tonight you are discussing an issue that speaks to the heart of what matters in Vancouver - a welcoming space for families, neighbourhoods, small businesses, children, young adults, elders, middle-aged adults in a multiplicity of jobs that service and make our city one that is a joy to live in.</p> <p>Spaces that support and provide affordable housing, ecologically-wise, communally compassionate. Communities that invite strangers to become neighbours. Neighbours to become friends. The 6-8 storey buildings that have been built in recent year that echo the 3-4 storey older apartment buildings in Mount Pleasant make a neighbourhood liveable.</p> <p>I strongly protest the proposed Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP) which treats the City of Vancouver as a one-size fits all, a one-size plan that focuses on multi-block development of high-rise towers. As a former resident of Toronto, I have seen how the over-development of high-rise condo towers has negatively impacted that city and its residents.</p> <p>I'm not opposed to increased density. I'm opposed to pre-determined one-size fits all planning that is not responsive to the city's current and future needs. The plan as proposed is based on population growth guesstimates, and seeks to avoid future consultations and approvals within affected neighbourhoods in any meaningful way. Seeing the oversized towers already built along the skytrain routes en route to casts shadows on this ODP, which primarily serves the wealthy; small units in oversized towers do not serve families, nor those in need of supportive housing.</p> <p>I strongly support housing development plans that is committed to developing livable neighbourhoods in terms of affordable, liveable, low-to-medium-height family-sized unit buildings, with wood-construction that bolsters our forest industry, with a commitment to neighbourhood community building, space for parks, recreation, community centres, and services to support those who live in the neighbourhood, regardless of income and need. There is room for innovative creative, ecological development that is human-sized and affordable. Where are the co-ops? town housing? small development housing projects to help those in need? Community development plans are being replaced by a one-size fits all, but the fit is primarily developer-scaled for high-income earners.</p> <p>My three year old granddaughter's home and life will be darkened when the tower is built south of her parent's one bedroom unit in the four storey rental building where they live. The new tower will stand like a towering concrete Douglas fir tree in the middle of a bloc, in the middle of the neighbourhood. And no, her parents can't afford one of the new condos being built. One by one these affordable human-sized homes will be replaced with concrete towers, and the laughter of children will be silenced in the neighbourhoods that once were.</p> <p>I beg you not support the Vancouver Official Development Plan, that sees the city as a single unit, a neighbourhood as something to discard in favour of sky-high towers shading the sun. This decision will take away future decisions from us all.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Lynn Fels</p>	Lynn Fels	West Point Grey	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	14:59	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>It is disturbing to see the VOPD proceeding, with a goal to eliminate public input and consultation on the community in which we live. The scope of this plan prioritizes all the things that make a city unlivable. Highrise density, little meaningful and usable green space, no plan for community amenities to match the increased density. Extreme development in areas that are uniquely Vancouver and value water, beach and mountain view access. Years of work was spent developing neighbourhood plans that acknowledged the need for increased density but respected a neighbourhood community.</p> <p>Ironic that you ask what neighbourhood i live in, should your plan proceed we won't have Vancouver neighbourhoods, just 7 areas .....seriously disappointing.</p> <p>Equally ironic is the increase in density (towers towers everywhere) with an increasing vacancy rate, and yet no additional infrastructure. Water, sewer, garbage, hospitals and of course no parking.</p> <p>What happened to the sensibility of urban planning that anticipated future growth and needs, while prioritizing healthy strong communities. Your towers of 600sq foot rentals is not what future or current residents want.</p>	Joanne Webster	West Point Grey	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	14:59	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Councillors and Mayor,</p> <p>I strongly oppose the Vancouver Official Development Plan, particularly the heavy reliance on high-rise residential towers.</p> <p>High-rise tower developments do not provide a livable, long-term urban environment for most residents. They are generally not conducive to raising families and tend to weaken neighbourhood-level social connections that are essential for healthy communities.</p> <p>I DO NOT want to live in a city filled with concrete, towering high-rises, overcrowded, overheated, and unaffordable—nor do I want to face the likely risk of displacement! Vancouver is heading toward severe and irreversible negative changes. The Vancouver ODP commits the city to a path of inevitable decline in livability and quality of life. It abandons neighbourhood-based development plans carefully crafted by local residents. Your "one size fits all" proposal will lead to more high-rise towers and blocky, out-of-character buildings scattered throughout the city. The current City Council and provincial government appear determined to destroy what has made Vancouver such a beautiful and livable place.</p> <p>When dozens of experienced and respected urban planners, architects, and academics—who share admiration for the Vancouver they helped shape—call the plan “a wrong turn that will lock the city into 30 years of inflated land speculation, demolition of affordable housing, and a permanent loss of democratic oversight,” I urge you to listen.</p> <p>DO NOT turn Vancouver into Hong Kong or Manhattan, with people living in “dog crates” in the sky. Instead, focus on designing and building family-friendly, affordable, low- to mid-rise housing. Consider the alternative plan from the Jericho Coalition, which proposes high-density, livable, more sustainable, and more affordable urban development featuring 4-8-storey buildings. There is a far better way to densify Vancouver than what you outline in your ODP.</p> <p>Before embarking on such a disastrous multi-generational shift for Vancouver in the form of this ODP, LISTEN to the respected city planners, architects, and urbanists who strongly advise that the ODP be withdrawn.</p> <p>As elected leaders entrusted by Vancouver citizens to guide our city responsibly into the future, I ask you to withdraw the VANCOUVER ODP. I respectfully urge you to fundamentally revise the Vancouver ODP. The city should prioritize livable, low- and medium-rise development at a human scale, alongside proper investment in infrastructure such as parks, community centres, schools, and healthcare services. Reconsider the current high-rise-focused approach and check out the Jericho Coalition's plan as an alternative way to densify the city.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>	Frank Heintelmann	West Point Grey	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	15:01	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>The ODP needs to be paused for more consultation with residents and neighbourhoods. We have had too many changes in zoning and density in Vancouver.</p> <p>I don't agree with all the towers everywhere! Plus before the City starts Villages in Neighbourhoods it should concentrate on making sure the store fronts all fully leased. There is way to many vacant businesses throughout the City.</p> <p>I really oppose this ODP!</p> <p>Regards, Mary Tataryn</p>	Mary Tataryn	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-03-10	15:02	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Where is all the greenspace in this city of towers blocking the view of the mountains?	Cathy McGuire	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-03-10	15:02	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I urge City Council not to approve the ODP proposed by staff.</p> <p>I once again voice my objection to the ODP changes which remove the right of citizens to a public hearing. The public has not been adequately informed about the extent that the City is electing to remove those public hearing rights (as opposed to the extent that is provincially mandated).</p> <p>Input has not sufficiently been sought about affects to neighbourhoods. No public hearing notices have been mailed to the properties affected and most of the public has no idea this is happening.</p> <p>The bottom line is that insufficient notice has been given for a plan that removes hearing rights, and this amounts to a lack of due process. Homeowners who are affected should have been specifically notified. Communications to all residents should have been transparent about the impacts.</p> <p>In addition I oppose this draft ODP because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It focusses on a one size fits all approach in the place of community plans that preserve neighbourhood character.</li> <li>- It is vague and aspirational on many of the issues affecting quality of life in the City - there are no concrete plans or funding for added infrastructure like parks, community centres, or schools.</li> <li>- It focusses on towers rather than the types of homes that families actually want. We see this over and over again from the City - a reactive "crisis" driven response instead of thoughtful planning. Our neighbourhoods will be changed forever: there will be consequences for all residents of the City and in particular those who are being actively displaced from older affordable liveable units and housing. Can it really be that the City thinks their job is done their job if a bunch of towers are built, as opposed to building a city that actually supports people's lives? It is a simplistic numbers oriented approach in the place of real planning.</li> </ul>	Eve Munro	Kitsilano	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	15:03	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	Along with many neighbourhood coalitions and experienced urban planners in Vancouver, I am opposed to the broad changes proposed by the Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP). My concerns are the following: a) ODP does not consider unique character of neighbourhoods as livable communities, b) no consideration for family-suitable housing (larger units, lower rise buildings, not towers), c) limits of current infrastructure capacity, d) inadequate green spaces and tree canopy for changing climate and mental health, e) no planning for schools and community services, f) lack of sufficient public consultation. Please do NOT approve this plan as it has many drawbacks and omissions. Most importantly please DO listen to your community members. We do not want Vancouver to become Hong Kong tower land. We need creative financing solutions and sustainable design options for our housing crisis. Towers with tiny expensive units will not serve Vancouver residents and keep our city livable and beautiful. Thank you!	Bernadette Mah	Dunbar-Southlands	
2026-03-10	15:03	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I oppose to the reduction/elimination of public hearings when considering building plans and re-zoning neighbourhoods. The character, green space, access to sunlight, and small independent businesses have already decreased significantly in the last few years with the rapid densification of my neighbourhood, which has led to a lower quality of life. Public discourse and consultation should be a requirement when approving massive development projects, an all-city plan, and any re-zoning, to ensure a gentle transition between zoning types (types of structures), and a neighbourhood by neighbourhood (community) approach. I am against the Vancouver Official Development Plan.	Suzanne Munson	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	15:07	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	One of the most consequential changes embedded in the ODP is procedural (the prohibition of most public hearings). A focus on more and more towers and large blocky buildings everywhere. Scrapping of community plans in favour of a "one size fits all" approach, citywide. 100,000 land parcels are affected in Vancouver, but almost no one has been notified Population projections courtesy of the real estate industry instead of official government numbers. No meaningful plans or funding for added infrastructure, parks, community centres, or schools. Inadequate protections for renters. A focus on small, expensive units largely beyond the reach of people on median incomes. Already, there has been considerable land assembly as developers and speculators position themselves to take advantage of the ODP and benefit from reduced oversight by the public and even by the Vancouver City Council.	Diane Martin	West Point Grey	
2026-03-10	15:16	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	I object strongly to the city of Vancouver plan to build major developments of high rises and densification in an unrestricted manner. This negatively affects neighbourhoods where there has been limited input to prepare for density in population. Services are needed to be considered such as parks, transit, schools, and amenities. Current owners are not fairly treated. There should be a hold on this development plan to allow people to be really involved in the planning.	Myrna Franke	Kitsilano	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	15:17	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Hello - I have personally reviewed the ODP and am extremely disappointed that it ignores much about the neighbourhoods and the qualities that I love about this city. Instead of carefully considered increase of density, using low- and medium rise housing, prioritising adequate and appropriate accommodation and quality of life for citizens, the plan seems to favour throwing up high rise towers for the benefit of developers and the destruction of community.</p> <p>I agree with the attached Open Letter from 30 experts in the field – including ex-City planners.</p> <p>PLEASE WITHDRAW the Official Development Plan (ODP) and refer it back to staff and prioritise planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods with a truly sustainable future!</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Mike Woodbridge	Kitsilano	
2026-03-10	15:27	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Controlled densification of Kitsilano is an inevitable evolution of our city. With that said, it is crucial that the CoV makes sure that infrastructure (roadways, sewers, transit service) keep up with the growth rate. Neighbourhood cohesion should equally be a priority, with each new project that moves beyond single family/duplex be considered on a case specific basis. I urge City Council to allow for the review of each individual multi-unit development, to allow for a thoughtful, progressive, and logical rate of growth specific to the location of the proposed development.</p> <p>It would also be informative to take some time to assess the traffic and infrastructure impacts of the rapid transit extension to Arbutus. In particular CoV should assess the current approach of densification along transit corridors to see what impact it is having on travel times east-west, and if it is having the intended effect of providing more housing for the targeted mid and lower income level households.</p> <p>Balancing growth with the preservation of key character neighbourhoods requires being thoughtful about each and every development that breaks from the character and zoning or existing housing. Creating densification hubs is more appropriate than randomized infill with developments that ruin the visual vernacular of a street/neighbourhood.</p>	Zoe Younger	Kitsilano	

**City of Vancouver Official Development Plan - Oppose**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2026-03-10	15:37	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I urge you to not approve the Plan and to engage in meaningful public consultation before the ODP is reconsidered.</p> <p>The process for developing the ODP has lacked the appropriate public engagement necessary to meet the standard for procedural fairness. It cannot be supported without comprehensive public consultation.</p> <p>The ODP is based on flawed and biased data such as the real estate industry’s population projections provided in the Rennie growth analysis included as an appendix to the Plan.</p> <p>The ODP demonstrates a concerning lack of consideration for housing supporting infrastructure such as parks and public spaces, recreation facilities, schools and permeable landscape providing habitat for both wildlife and people.</p> <p>Where the ODP should include strong language to disincentivize redevelopment of existing viable affordable housing stock, the Plan instead puts large swaths of our most deeply affordable housing in serious jeopardy. The ODP has a dangerously low bar on affordability requirements for new development and encourages a speculative nightmare of entitlements trading, turning Vancouver into a land-based stock exchange.</p> <p>The Plan paints our City with a generalist brush that clearly misunderstands both the value and needs of the rich tapestry of communities that make this place renowned. For example, great cities of the world, both large and small, are noteworthy for their layers of built heritage forming a meaningful and elegant public realm. The ODP shows no effort to recognize or retain our built heritage, of which we have so little. Once that heritage is lost, it’s gone forever along with the soul and character of our City. We throw such neighbourhood fabric away at our peril. Don’t be remembered as the Council that sanitized this place.</p> <p>The greatest urban planning minds of our region have expressed deep concerns about the impact of this Plan. We ask you to reject the ODP and send it back for genuine robust public consultation.</p>	Craig Ollenberger	Grandview-Woodland	
2026-03-10	15:38	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed new ODP and strongly urge the council to withdraw this proposal and renew consultation with citizens and neighbourhood groups, and especially with the Housing Reset group (comprised of 30 well-known Vancouver-area experts in aspects of city planning, and/or knowledge of Vancouver’s history, statistics, possibilities and needs) and to re-examine Vancouver's unique needs, history, and possibilities.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Joan Bunn		

2026-03-10	15:53	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear City Council:</p> <p>As a community resident, I object to the ODP directing that most of West Point Grey and Kitsilano be turned into a transit-oriented development area.</p> <p>The many concerns about this ODP include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The ODP overrides local community plans that have been developed and agreed to by Vancouver communities in a consultative fashion over many years, as well as overriding community planning processes.</li> <li>*The ODP scraps community plans in favour of a one-size-fits all citywide approach.</li> <li>*Ignoring neighbourhood context, the ODP will bring more oversized towers and large blocky buildings that overwhelm neighbourhood scale.</li> <li>*The ODP affects ~100,000 land parcels in Vancouver, but awareness has not been adequately raised among residents, and so they have not had a meaningful way to assess how this affects them or respond effectively.</li> <li>*No meaningful plans or funding for added infrastructure, parks, community centres or schools are in place.</li> <li>*The ODP gives inadequate protections for renters. It focuses on small, expensive units largely beyond the reach of people on moderate incomes. Thus it will bring the problems of increased density without the promised benefits of affordable housing.</li> </ul> <p>Please reject the ODP and return to the precedent of respecting local community planning.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Naomi W. Reichstein Vancouver</p>	Naomi Reichstein		
2026-03-10	15:55	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>I oppose the ODP because the extreme densification (high rises) spanning a 6-7 block radius around the arbutus line in Kits is well beyond what is acceptable. It is reasonable to have high rise developments along the main artery of West Broadway, but not extending into small neighborhood streets.</p> <p>Low rise (4-6 stories) buildings in the Jericho lands and multiplex duplexes/triplexes in other residential neighborhoods are reasonable measures to increase housing availability but retain aesthetic character. However, even these densification measures would challenge existing infrastructure such as road traffic, school capacity etc.</p> <p>The public must be consulted on these projects and removing these opportunities would be unjust and unreasonable. There is no one-size-fits-all blanket approach to deal with these issues.</p>	Vicky Aneliunas	West Point Grey	
2026-03-10	15:55	City of Vancouver Official Development Plan	Oppose	<p>Dear Mayor Sim and Council,</p> <p>This is to register my strong opposition to the Vancouver Official Development Plan (ODP). I am one of the 30 signers to the letter from urbanists, urban planners, architects and UBC/SFU academics, of which I am aligned. (See link at the end for the full letter.)</p> <p>Please refer this back to staff for reconsideration through a meaningful public participatory process, before adoption.</p>	Elizabeth Murphy		

The main concerns in the letter are further summarized as:

1. Questionable Population and Unit Projection Methodology

There has been a major shift of how the Vancouver ODP and Regional Context Statement calculate population and unit growth projections. Rather than a traditional approach of using regional population projections as allocated to the City by the Region, population additions have been instead determined by consultants based on the capacity of the existing and newly approved development pipeline process.

This is resulting in vastly larger growth projections than is realistic given the current economic downturn. And in turn this results in a large amount of over-zoning beyond realistic population growth projections.

2. Excessive Development Without Affordability

The City consultant's growth projections show that, with only the development currently approved and in the pipeline, there is already enough capacity to serve growth to 2050. So the City is creating far over capacity of market development beyond what is required for realistic population growth. This ODP would result in massive land inflation, speculation, and demolition of more existing affordable housing than it would build, displacing thousands of people.

3. Inadequate Infrastructure, Parks, Recreation, Schools and Amenities

The ODP includes almost no increased infrastructure, parks, recreation, schools and amenities for the massive increase in projected population growth, or any additional funding resources to support it. This will particularly affect many neighbourhoods that are already underserved yet are slated for massive growth under the ODP.

4. Loss of Participatory Planning, Neighbourhood Context, and Transparent Approvals Process

All of the existing community, neighbourhood and area plans are headed for major revision or elimination altogether. Every area-wide or community plan will be amended to state that the ODP is the guiding policy document, making them effectively irrelevant.

This is the new world of one-size-fits-all zoning based on a limited choice of basic building form typologies.

5. Excessive Literal Implementation of Provincial Mandates

The City of Vancouver cannot solely blame the BC zoning bills for this one-size-fits-all approach; the Vancouver Plan already promoted this strategy. The City should instead be challenging these mandates rather than rushing through the ODP well in advance of the June 30 deadline, that the Province has shown to be flexible on for other municipalities.

In conclusion

Both the Vancouver Plan and ODP have not had any meaningful public participation in the planning process. It is false to suggest otherwise.

Vastly increasing development capacity beyond population growth projections will only increase speculation, development pressure on infrastructure, amenities, heritage and the urban forest canopy, while displacing thousands of people and raising GHGs.

			<p>Since Vancouver is already way over capacity for zoning to meet future growth, while we are in a major market correction, we have time to plan properly.</p> <p>Refer this ODP back to staff for reconsideration through a democratic participatory planning process that prioritizes planning for a livable affordable city of neighbourhoods that will meet future needs.</p> <p>Full Letter here: <a href="https://housingreset.ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/">https://housingreset[.]ca/2026/02/25/cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp/</a></p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments, they are as follows:

I, and pretty well everyone I've ever talked to in the area ( Kitsilano ) feel that the proposed tall towers do not fit into the area and immediate surroundings at all.

The Kitsilano area consists mainly of low rise ( 4 stories ) or less buildings. The residents of this area live here as it has a unique community feel and is one the last neighbourhoods that still has distinctive and historical character. There are already enough areas; the West End, Coal Harbour, False Creek that have towers and to have Kitsilano be absorbed into that kind of density. It would be a tragedy to destroy this area of Kitsilano, once it's done, there's no going back, you will have destroyed it forever. Kitsilano is famous for this unique feel, and rushing more density into this area would dramatically undermine the neighbourhood's uniqueness.

I'm yet to meet anyone visiting the area who hasn't commented on the horrible monolithic Senkw towers looming over Vanier Park when they see them for the first time, and only 3 of 11 are built. How the City let this happen is tragic. Vancouver is simply becoming a mediocre, over built, badly planned middle tier city, not the envy of so many jurisdictions.

After many years of the City granting homeowners density if they agreed to build or renovate in the character of Kitsilano's Victorian style homes, it seems absurd to be allowing tall, modern buildings into a neighbourhood that has gone to great lengths to have a consistent character.

Residents in our area are extremely upset that the City has been very misleading about the "Broadway Plan", calling developments that are nowhere near Broadway. Most people are all for towers in areas with other towers like along Broadway, or other main corridors, but this building will negatively impact the aesthetic of our neighbourhood.

If the City's goals are to provide housing, why are you not placing people into all the new buildings that are sitting empty ? The market has tanked and the City should be looking at ways to get people into all of the recently completed buildings around the city.

Recently a letter provided by a number of city planning experts was presented ( see attached ). Many of these people ( ie; Ray Spaxman ), are world renowned for their visionary approach to city planning and how their expertise has made Vancouver an example of careful long term planning through careful and controlled development.

I urge Council to reconsider their rush to densify before the character of many of Vancouver's neighbourhoods and the city's reputation as one of the world's beautiful cities is destroyed. This is already underway by removing protections on view corridors.

I also urge Council to review an article in the Jan. 16, 2026 Globe & Mail, titled The big advantage of building small. featuring an interesting interview with the CEO of one of Vancouver's active developers.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



## APPENDIX B

Nancy Alexander

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

March 9, 2026

Vancouver City Hall  
453 West 12th Avenue  
Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 1V4

*Delivered by hand*

Dear Mayor Ken Sim and Councillors Mike Klassen, Peter Meiszner, Rebecca Bligh, Brian Montague, Sarah Kirby-Yung, Lisa Dominato, Lenny Zhou, Pete Fry, Sean Orr, Lucy Maloney.

Please **cancel** the proposed ODP and consider the combined experience of the **30 (!)** top urban experts who, in their letter of February 25th to you, oppose the proposed Official Development Plan. I appreciate the contributions still of Larry Beasley, Lance Berelowitz, Patrick Condon, Frank Ducote, Michael Geller, Barbara Gordon, Penny Gurstein, Scot Hein, Norman Hotson, Sandy James, David Ley, Mike Mangan, Darlene Marzari, Bill McCreery, Sean McEwen, Graham McGarva, Elizabeth Murphy, Brian Palmquist, Tom Phipps, Mary Pynenburg, Robert Renger, Mary Beth Rondeau, Ralph Segal, Ray Spaxman, Sara Stevens, Erick Villagomez, Army Wise, David Wong, Elvin Wyly, Andy Yan.

When I attend City Hall meetings and info sessions in the community I am dismayed by the limited willingness to explore ideas other than uninspired rezoning and development. For example, issues thoughtfully identified by speakers at City Hall meetings rarely garner a response; citizens seem mere impediments to anything from spot rezoning to the cancellation of view corridors that were years in the making.

I see citizens and experts at City Hall discouraged from voicing feedback. All the great talent in this city's citizenry, educational institutions and interest groups and all we have is the proposed ODP? As a Kitsilano resident I face the razing of my diverse neighbourhood -diverse in density, housing types, populations, ages and stages, and incomes. Now, in addition to eradicating my neighbourhood you want to eliminate what little formal input neighbourhoods across the city have into decisions by mayor and council.

I like how the above-noted letter with 30 signatories encapsulates my concerns about process in their five main points: questionable population and unit projection methodology; excessive development without affordability; inadequate infrastructure for parks, recreation, schools and amenities; loss of participatory planning, neighbourhood context, and transparent approvals process; excessive literal implementation of provincial mandates. I hope I can see positive results in such a call to democratic and coherent action.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



March 9, 2026

City of Vancouver

Dear Mayor Sim and City Council,

Re: City of Vancouver Draft Official Development Plan (ODP) Public hearing March 10, 2026

The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) is opposed to the Official Development Plan (ODP). While we recognize the need for citywide planning, we are greatly concerned about both the process this has undertaken and the proposed ODP content.

**Process:** First, we would like to address the process. Both the ODP and Vancouver Plan have not had meaningful public engagement or consultation that has instead focused on development industry and related groups interests.

Even though the ODP has such a major impact on the city for the future, there have been no mail out notices of this public hearing to the 100,000 properties citywide affected by this plan. Only the very minimum for a public hearing notice, and even that is questionable given that the City posted the wrong version of the referral report on the public hearing page up to only four business days before the hearing.

**The general public is largely unaware of the Vancouver Plan or the ODP.** The very limited engagement on the Vancouver Plan did not address the many concerns raised by the public, including our comments. There was only one draft ODP engagement in October 2025. It was 204 pages, much of it technical, with many other related documents and displays, but the public was only given about two weeks to review and ask questions. Only four poorly advertised and lightly attended open houses for the whole city over the two weeks. Again, no mail out notices to the affected properties.

The Vancouver Plan Urban Growth Strategy map has now been relabelled as Urban Structure Strategy. This is misleading since it is in fact the transit oriented development urban growth for the future and is buried in the document as if it is inconsequential.

Most people who look at this document, if they see it at all, they will have no idea what it all means to them or the future of the city. In fact, our groups and members are still struggling to understand it all.

Our previous draft ODP comments and concerns have not been addressed in the current ODP referral report and can be found [here](#) for reference.

**This is not a legitimate process for the only public hearing on this substantive plan .** Once adopted, there will be no further public hearings on any rezonings consistent with the ODP Generalized Land Use provisions.

Here is a small selection of our many previous concerns with the Vancouver Plan and draft ODP, that now also apply to the ODP public hearing as follows:

### **1. No Neighbourhood-based Planning - One Size Fits All**

Policies are too broad-brushed and rely on a one-size-fits-all approach. The Urban Structures / Urban Growth plan draws lines on the map of Vancouver in swaths of mauve and purple showing large areas of the city scheduled for redevelopment — yet each neighbourhood is unique. Areas where added density can work may be in smaller pockets in particular parts of a neighbourhood. The draft plan places too much emphasis on increasing the number of housing units, and not enough on different types of housing. Neighbourhood-based planning from the ground up would have procured opportunities for densification that respect existing neighbourhoods and fit into the local context. The ODP plan, if approved, results in repealing/amending all existing neighbourhood Community Plans and Community Visions, which were based on years of neighbourhood involvement and extensive participation done in good faith. **Excessive literal implementation of the BC zoning bills goes far beyond provincial mandates and is unnecessary to meet population growth projections.**

### **2. Lack of Urban Design**

The plan does not prioritize good urban design. Some of the suggestions, like six storeys in shopping districts purportedly to preserve sunlight access but 12 storeys along residential streets, minimize the impact of high buildings on sunlight and livability on shopping, but not on living. Former senior planners with the City are expressing their concerns over poor urban design. Ralph Segal says, “...approval of the Vancouver Plan and its approach to planning and affordable housing, will nail it as a disaster.” (<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/vancouver/article-generation-density-past-planners-speak-out-on-urban-development/>) We are seeing this in the Broadway Plan area that is now part of the ODP, and is being spread throughout the city.

### **3. Excessive Population Targets**

The population targets chosen are too high and the plan does not give enough recognition to possible changes in economic conditions currently underway and over the next thirty years. The [Region](#) has provided updated population growth projections to 2050 for the City of Vancouver as of September 2025, with a low of 130,000, mid of 195,000 and high growth of 252,000 people. However, Rennie in Appendix G of the report, states ..."rather than a traditional approach of using regional population as allocated to the City, population additions have been determined by the capacity of the existing and new housing stock to accommodate people." This is a major unusual shift. And they assume much higher growth of 271,000, **the highest option, and far beyond the historical average increase of 1% per year. And they show that the entire projected growth to 2050 could be accommodated by the development currently already approved and in the pipeline. this puts in question the need for so much new growth in the ODP.** Such a high target puts more and more pressure on neighbourhoods and infrastructure to absorb more and more housing.

### **4. Lack of Consideration of Existing Capacity**

The plan includes very little recognition of existing capacity in existing zoning, and of the potential population increase in large sites and projects already being planned, such as Jericho Lands, Heather Lands, , Seńákw, Rupert station, or Cambie Corridor. It also fails to consider the massive increases of development in the ODP of primarily apartment buildings from 6 storeys to high towers, and the change to allow new duplexes in RS zones, now increased to multiplexes in R1-1.

## **5. Too many Rental Towers (mainly for REITs) and too little Ground-Oriented Family Housing**

The plan does not give enough consideration of different types of housing, including ownership, co-op, and rental, that will be needed over the next 30 years for families, as well as single people and couples. As the years pass, more and more single people who currently seek apartment rentals will be forming families and wanting housing that is ground-oriented and large enough for a family with one or two children to live in over the long term. Many will want the chance to buy a home or a co-op unit where they can feel securely housed.

Over and over in the plan, planners prioritize rental and social housing, with an excessive emphasis on the tower form. There are very small number of areas left in the city proposed for multiplexes that do not currently have towers (such as the RT character areas of Kitsilano, Grandview-Woodlands and Mount Pleasant) and the RT zones are being eliminated. Even in the multiplex areas, planners also leave open the option for apartments, thereby undermining the potential for multiplexes to be built.

## **6. No Policy for Heritage Buildings and Character Retention Incentives Undermined**

The plan makes no clear statement or indication that buildings on the Heritage Register (whether or not legally designated as heritage) will be protected from demolition and redevelopment. The plan offers very little recognition or emphasis on the city's heritage buildings, and no strategy as to how they can be retained. The plan mentions making the Heritage Register more equitable but offers no description of what that might entail.

By adding so much new larger development it undermines current character house retention incentives, increases in embodied carbon, and loss of neighbourhood character and streetscapes. There is still no option to add two secondary suites as an incentive for character house retention.

## **7. Not Enough Provision of Green Space (Private and Public)**

There is not enough consideration given to the serious impacts of redevelopment proposed by the plan on green space and tree canopy, with implications for carbon capture, rain run-off and the urban heat island.

## **8. Embodied Emissions**

The plan does not adequately consider carbon footprints and embodied emissions associated with new development, especially the use of concrete and glass in new tower buildings. It offers no consideration of policies to actually mitigate embodied emissions.

<https://vancouver.sun.com/opinion/columnists/douglas-todd-the-hidden-climate-costs-of-b-c-s-burgeoning-highrisers-part-ii>

## **9. City Services**

The plan contains no significant consideration of how the City will provide the amenities, green space, and services such as schools, that will be needed if the population expands to meet targets stated in the plan. There appears to be no acknowledgement that the need for green space and community centres will increase even more due to high density tower development.

## **10. Lack of Social License**

There were no advertisements, articles, or notices in newspapers or other mainstream media that the Vancouver Plan came to Council on July 6, 2022, in the middle of the summer when people are on holidays right before the election in October 2022. Then it was a landslide election, wiping out almost all of previous council, clearly signalling a desire for change. Unfortunately, the public did not get that change. Instead the ODP is now just a repeat of the same plan but worse, and again only two weeks to respond to the huge draft ODP without any public notices mailed or meaningful opportunities for public input or consultation.

At the time of the Vancouver Plan, the Ipsos Reid Survey referred to in the report is the only randomized survey that has been conducted with under 200 people. Only 15% of the respondents said that they strongly support the Land Use Strategy. Everyone else had some or many concerns. Throughout the Vancouver Plan process the level of public support was misrepresented. The ODP process relies almost exclusively on this prior Vancouver Plan process.

We would also like to voice our support for the HousingReset.ca letter from the 30 urbanists, urban planners, architects and UBC/SFU academics, with decades of experience.

They raise many important issues with the ODP, that also reflect our concerns.

<file:///C:/Users/Owner/Downloads/2026-02-25-housingreset-cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp-ph-1-2.pdf>

Please do not approve this flawed plan. Instead, refer this back to staff for a participatory public process to reflect meaningful local neighbourhood based planning in the ODP. Provide for realistic population growth, and strive for: livability in the context of local character; address environmental impacts; include measures to avoid displacement from existing relatively affordable housing; and give adequate consideration to more affordable housing options, including ground-oriented housing for families, co-ops, and other models for both renters and owners, with amenities and adequate infrastructure in each neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairs Larry Bengé & Dorothy Barkley  
CVN Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

### **Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods**

Arbutus Ridge Community Association  
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours  
Dunbar Residents Association  
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee  
Grandview Woodland Area Council  
Greater Yaletown Community Association  
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association  
Kits Point Residents Association  
NW Point Grey Home Owners Association  
Oakridge Langara Area Residents

Residents Association Mount Pleasant  
Riley Park/South Cambie Advisory Group  
Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc.  
Strathcona Residents Association  
Upper Kitsilano Residents Association  
West End Neighbours Society  
West Kitsilano Residents Association  
West Point Grey Residents Association  
West Southland Residents Association

### **Public Hearing Reference Links:**

Public Hearing Agenda: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20260310/phea20260310ag.htm>

Referral Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20260310/documents/phea1rr.pdf>



March 9, 2026

City of Vancouver

Dear Mayor Sim and City Council,

Re: City of Vancouver Draft Official Development Plan (ODP) Public hearing March 10, 2026

The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) is opposed to the Official Development Plan (ODP). While we recognize the need for citywide planning, we are greatly concerned about both the process this has undertaken and the proposed ODP content.

**Process:** First, we would like to address the process. Both the ODP and Vancouver Plan have not had meaningful public engagement or consultation that has instead focused on development industry and related groups interests.

Even though the ODP has such a major impact on the city for the future, there have been no mail out notices of this public hearing to the 100,000 properties citywide affected by this plan. Only the very minimum for a public hearing notice, and even that is questionable given that the City posted the wrong version of the referral report on the public hearing page up to only four business days before the hearing.

**The general public is largely unaware of the Vancouver Plan or the ODP.** The very limited engagement on the Vancouver Plan did not address the many concerns raised by the public, including our comments. There was only one draft ODP engagement in October 2025. It was 204 pages, much of it technical, with many other related documents and displays, but the public was only given about two weeks to review and ask questions. Only four poorly advertised and lightly attended open houses for the whole city over the two weeks. Again, no mail out notices to the affected properties.

The Vancouver Plan Urban Growth Strategy map has now been relabelled as Urban Structure Strategy. This is misleading since it is in fact the transit oriented development urban growth for the future and is buried in the document as if it is inconsequential.

Most people who look at this document, if they see it at all, they will have no idea what it all means to them or the future of the city. In fact, our groups and members are still struggling to understand it all.

Our previous draft ODP comments and concerns have not been addressed in the current ODP referral report and can be found [here](#) for reference.

**This is not a legitimate process for the only public hearing on this substantive plan .** Once adopted, there will be no further public hearings on any rezonings consistent with the ODP Generalized Land Use provisions.

Here is a small selection of our many previous concerns with the Vancouver Plan and draft ODP, that now also apply to the ODP public hearing as follows:

### **1. No Neighbourhood-based Planning - One Size Fits All**

Policies are too broad-brushed and rely on a one-size-fits-all approach. The Urban Structures / Urban Growth plan draws lines on the map of Vancouver in swaths of mauve and purple showing large areas of the city scheduled for redevelopment — yet each neighbourhood is unique. Areas where added density can work may be in smaller pockets in particular parts of a neighbourhood. The draft plan places too much emphasis on increasing the number of housing units, and not enough on different types of housing. Neighbourhood-based planning from the ground up would have procured opportunities for densification that respect existing neighbourhoods and fit into the local context. The ODP plan, if approved, results in repealing/amending all existing neighbourhood Community Plans and Community Visions, which were based on years of neighbourhood involvement and extensive participation done in good faith. **Excessive literal implementation of the BC zoning bills goes far beyond provincial mandates and is unnecessary to meet population growth projections.**

### **2. Lack of Urban Design**

The plan does not prioritize good urban design. Some of the suggestions, like six storeys in shopping districts purportedly to preserve sunlight access but 12 storeys along residential streets, minimize the impact of high buildings on sunlight and livability on shopping, but not on living. Former senior planners with the City are expressing their concerns over poor urban design. Ralph Segal says, "...approval of the Vancouver Plan and its approach to planning and affordable housing, will nail it as a disaster." (<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/vancouver/article-generation-density-past-planners-speak-out-on-urban-development/>) We are seeing this in the Broadway Plan area that is now part of the ODP, and is being spread throughout the city.

### **3. Excessive Population Targets**

The population targets chosen are too high and the plan does not give enough recognition to possible changes in economic conditions currently underway and over the next thirty years. The [Region](#) has provided updated population growth projections to 2050 for the City of Vancouver as of September 2025, with a low of 130,000, mid of 195,000 and high growth of 252,000 people. However, Rennie in Appendix G of the report, states ..."rather than a traditional approach of using regional population as allocated to the City, population additions have been determined by the capacity of the existing and new housing stock to accommodate people." This is a major unusual shift. And they assume much higher growth of 271,000, **the highest option, and far beyond the historical average increase of 1% per year. And they show that the entire projected growth to 2050 could be accommodated by the development currently already approved and in the pipeline. this puts in question the need for so much new growth in the ODP.** Such a high target puts more and more pressure on neighbourhoods and infrastructure to absorb more and more housing.

### **4. Lack of Consideration of Existing Capacity**

The plan includes very little recognition of existing capacity in existing zoning, and of the potential population increase in large sites and projects already being planned, such as Jericho Lands, Heather Lands, , Seńákw, Rupert station, or Cambie Corridor. It also fails to consider the massive increases of development in the ODP of primarily apartment buildings from 6 storeys to high towers, and the change to allow new duplexes in RS zones, now increased to multiplexes in R1-1.

## **5. Too many Rental Towers (mainly for REITs) and too little Ground-Oriented Family Housing**

The plan does not give enough consideration of different types of housing, including ownership, co-op, and rental, that will be needed over the next 30 years for families, as well as single people and couples. As the years pass, more and more single people who currently seek apartment rentals will be forming families and wanting housing that is ground-oriented and large enough for a family with one or two children to live in over the long term. Many will want the chance to buy a home or a co-op unit where they can feel securely housed.

Over and over in the plan, planners prioritize rental and social housing, with an excessive emphasis on the tower form. There are very small number of areas left in the city proposed for multiplexes that do not currently have towers (such as the RT character areas of Kitsilano, Grandview-Woodlands and Mount Pleasant) and the RT zones are being eliminated. Even in the multiplex areas, planners also leave open the option for apartments, thereby undermining the potential for multiplexes to be built.

## **6. No Policy for Heritage Buildings and Character Retention Incentives Undermined**

The plan makes no clear statement or indication that buildings on the Heritage Register (whether or not legally designated as heritage) will be protected from demolition and redevelopment. The plan offers very little recognition or emphasis on the city's heritage buildings, and no strategy as to how they can be retained. The plan mentions making the Heritage Register more equitable but offers no description of what that might entail.

By adding so much new larger development it undermines current character house retention incentives, increases in embodied carbon, and loss of neighbourhood character and streetscapes. There is still no option to add two secondary suites as an incentive for character house retention.

## **7. Not Enough Provision of Green Space (Private and Public)**

There is not enough consideration given to the serious impacts of redevelopment proposed by the plan on green space and tree canopy, with implications for carbon capture, rain run-off and the urban heat island.

## **8. Embodied Emissions**

The plan does not adequately consider carbon footprints and embodied emissions associated with new development, especially the use of concrete and glass in new tower buildings. It offers no consideration of policies to actually mitigate embodied emissions.

<https://vancouver.sun.com/opinion/columnists/douglas-todd-the-hidden-climate-costs-of-b-c-s-burgeoning-highrisers-part-ii>

## **9. City Services**

The plan contains no significant consideration of how the City will provide the amenities, green space, and services such as schools, that will be needed if the population expands to meet targets stated in the plan. There appears to be no acknowledgement that the need for green space and community centres will increase even more due to high density tower development.

## **10. Lack of Social License**

There were no advertisements, articles, or notices in newspapers or other mainstream media that the Vancouver Plan came to Council on July 6, 2022, in the middle of the summer when people are on holidays right before the election in October 2022. Then it was a landslide election, wiping out almost all of previous council, clearly signalling a desire for change. Unfortunately, the public did not get that change. Instead the ODP is now just a repeat of the same plan but worse, and again only two weeks to respond to the huge draft ODP without any public notices mailed or meaningful opportunities for public input or consultation.

At the time of the Vancouver Plan, the Ipsos Reid Survey referred to in the report is the only randomized survey that has been conducted with under 200 people. Only 15% of the respondents said that they strongly support the Land Use Strategy. Everyone else had some or many concerns. Throughout the Vancouver Plan process the level of public support was misrepresented. The ODP process relies almost exclusively on this prior Vancouver Plan process.

We would also like to voice our support for the HousingReset.ca letter from the 30 urbanists, urban planners, architects and UBC/SFU academics, with decades of experience.

They raise many important issues with the ODP, that also reflect our concerns.

<file:///C:/Users/Owner/Downloads/2026-02-25-housingreset-cov-vancouver-official-development-plan-odp-ph-1-2.pdf>

Please do not approve this flawed plan. Instead, refer this back to staff for a participatory public process to reflect meaningful local neighbourhood based planning in the ODP. Provide for realistic population growth, and strive for: livability in the context of local character; address environmental impacts; include measures to avoid displacement from existing relatively affordable housing; and give adequate consideration to more affordable housing options, including ground-oriented housing for families, co-ops, and other models for both renters and owners, with amenities and adequate infrastructure in each neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairs Larry Bengé & Dorothy Barkley

CVN Steering Committee, Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

### **Network Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods**

Arbutus Ridge Community Association  
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours  
Dunbar Residents Association  
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee  
Grandview Woodland Area Council  
Greater Yaletown Community Association  
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association  
Kits Point Residents Association  
NW Point Grey Home Owners Association  
Oakridge Langara Area Residents

Residents Association Mount Pleasant  
Riley Park/South Cambie Advisory Group  
Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Assoc.  
Strathcona Residents Association  
Upper Kitsilano Residents Association  
West End Neighbours Society  
West Kitsilano Residents Association  
West Point Grey Residents Association  
West Southland Residents Association

### **Public Hearing Reference Links:**

Public Hearing Agenda: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20260310/phea20260310ag.htm>

Referral Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20260310/documents/phea1rr.pdf>